

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1878.

ART. I.—THE LATE GENERAL SYNOD.

—
BY THE EDITOR.
—

THE meeting of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, held in Lancaster, Pa., May 15th to the 23d, was pleasant and interesting in many respects, but it was chiefly noted for the adoption of measures looking towards a reconciliation of the two parties or tendencies which for years have been arrayed against each other. Whatever may be the result of those measures the meeting will be regarded as a kind of landmark in the Church's history. The question of the Liturgy which has so largely entered into the controversy came before the first General Synod held at Pittsburg in the year 1863, through an overture from the Synod of Ohio. Permission was given to the Ohio Synod "to prepare a liturgy which in their judgment may be better adapted to the wants of the Church" (than the Eastern liturgy), and the Eastern Synod was directed to revise its liturgy with a view to final action on the whole subject.

At the Synod of Dayton in 1866 the question came up a second time. The Synod of Ohio merely reported progress, not having brought their work to a conclusion, whilst the Eastern Synod presented the Order of Worship as the result of their revision of what was called the Provisional Liturgy. The whole subject was referred to a committee upon whose report a

memorable discussion took place, lasting from Tuesday afternoon until Thursday evening.

The next General Synod was held in Philadelphia in 1869, at which action was taken allowing the free use of both the liturgies, the Eastern and the Western, with the view of giving freedom to the two tendencies in the Church which these liturgies had now come to represent. At the meeting of the General Synod in Cincinnati in 1872 the Liturgical Question did not come up, but in its stead the point of contention was in regard to the Theological School in connection with Ursinus College. At this Synod the party represented by the Western liturgy was for the first time in the majority.

Then came the Synod of Fort Wayne at which the adherents of the Eastern liturgy were again in the ascendent, and the main discussion between the two tendencies again turned upon the question of theological teaching. Thus the theological controversy which commenced, indeed, long before the General Synod was organized, came up in one form or another at every triennial meeting of that body held.

It was pretty generally expected that it would come up in some form at the last meeting in Lancaster. The parties here were apparently equal in numerical strength. Two candidates were nominated for president. The first vote was a tie. The second ballot decided in favor of Dr. Van Horne by *two* majority, showing that the change of one vote turned the scale.

It was evident from the opening of the Synod that a new spirit—a spirit of kindness and peace—prevailed. The coming event, though entirely unexpected by both sides, seemed to have cast its sunshine before. On Monday evening the paper prepared by Dr. C. Z. Weiser was presented. After a suggestive and able preamble, it proposed the raising of a Commission to whom should be referred the matters in dispute between the two tendencies in the Church, with the view of uniting on some report to the next General Synod which may give permanent peace to the Church. The Synod was full, and a large number of spectators was present. The reading of the

paper, first in English, then in German, produced a profound sensation. It evidently touched a chord in all hearts which was ready to respond. On the motion to adopt, remarks of a most impressive character were made. The barriers that long separated brethren seemed to melt away. There was a very general feeling that the time for reconciliation had come. The speeches were brief but earnest, and seemed to be laden with the pent-up burden of the heart rather than the cool deliberation of the head. Both sides uttered the same sentiment, and when finally the vote came it was hearty and unanimous.

This action, once for all, determined all subsequent action on every subject that might otherwise have drawn out party lines. The divisions on questions that called out a division was made without reference to the two tendencies. The only question that might otherwise have revived the old antagonisms, the question of sending down the liturgies to the classes, was promptly referred to the Commission contemplated by the action already taken.

This commission as afterwards provided for by the report adopted is to be appointed by the several district synods on the basis of Church membership. It will consist, if we remember correctly, of twenty-five members, lay and clerical. Its first meeting will be held in the autumn of 1879. Until then the Church seems to be committed to the policy of peace and goodwill on all questions that have hitherto divided it. After that, it is hoped that the Commission will be able to direct in the way of a permanent reconciliation.

Different opinions will no doubt be entertained throughout the Church in regard to the effect of this action of the late General Synod. Some may be over-sanguine, others doubtful, and still others may have little or no confidence. The whole subject is open for consideration. It cannot be carried on with good effect and lasting results on the principle of repressing all discussion in regard to it. That ought not to be expected. If it is based on truth it will lose nothing by being examined in the light of calm, cool thought. Therefore we

regard it as a legitimate subject for discussion in the pages of this Review.

We favored the action of Synod on this subject, and we have confidence that it will result in good. We, therefore, propose in this article to present our reasons for this conclusion. Other minds hold the same conclusion for other different reasons. If our reasons are justified the conclusion must stand as safe and sound.

We do not look upon the long controversy through which we have passed as a Church as an evil, certainly not solely evil. It has accomplished lasting good results. Without entering into the merits of the discussion on the one side or the other we may assert so much in regard to it from general considerations. The issue of high and low-Churchism is an issue that became entailed upon Protestantism by the Reformation itself. It has been running its course in one form or another in all Protestant denominations. The fact that Protestantism started with two principles seemed already to forecast a dialectic process through which they would struggle toward inward reconciliation and unity. As one phase of this struggle we have had all along the contest between conservatism and radicalism, a contest, indeed, that enters more or less into the development of history universally. Just how far Protestantism should retain the permanent elements of the ancient and mediæval Church, and how far it should launch forth into new and untried courses, has been a question for all Protestant denominations. Its consideration has brought with it discussion, strife, and division. There is not a Reformation or historical Church in the world that has not been shaken by it. We need only to point to the high-Church and low-Church wings of the Episcopal body, the Old and New Lutherans, the Presbyterians, and the Puritans as illustrations of this truth.

In no Protestant body has this controversy been more vigorous and earnest than in the Reformed Church in the United States. It has brought with it both good and evil to the Church. The churchly and sacramental side of Chris-

tianity, and what is called its evangelical side, have been brought out to the apprehension of our people to an extent that would not have been attained without such a struggle. The controversy has reached to every important doctrine of Christianity and every question of Church cultus and polity. Our people have become informed on all these subjects. The discussion has gone into congregations and families. Even if we take the position that but little good and greater evil result from such theological discussion, the fact remains that we would not have learned this lesson without the experience through which we have passed. But that is not our opinion. Theological progress enters as an essential element into progress in faith. Faith and knowledge cannot be sundered. The one involves the other.

There have been errors on both sides. We claim but ordinary insight into the merits of what has been called the Mercersburg theology, and speak of it only for ourself, when we say that with what we regard as its many good qualities, it drew along with it certain errors and faults. We call these excrescences that went along with the Mercersburg Movement. Others may regard them as fatally inherent in the movement. We will not dispute about that. Suffice it that we have outgrown them and left them behind. So also we are persuaded that the opposition to the Mercersburg theology developed unchurchly, radical elements that would have endangered our old Church life and Church customs. Evils undoubtedly went along with the controversy, evils which made many hearts bleed and the Church mourn. It is not necessary to refer to these specifically.

But, allowing all that has now been said, has the controversy really settled the issues between the contending parties? Some might ask, has it settled anything? If a discussion had arisen at the late Synod on the liturgy question, for instance, would not the same old antagonisms have appeared, and would not the two parties have been as wide apart as ever? And if that be the case, that the issues are still unsolved, is

there any gain in calling a halt and merely resolving not to discuss them any more? Before we proceed to our main answer, we say here in passing, that in our opinion the two tendencies are not so wide apart as formerly, that on some points at least they are a good deal nearer together than when the discussion began, or when it raged most fiercely. Each side has learned to see some errors on its own side and some merits on the other. This may be accounted for partly indeed by the fact that the differences in some cases were only imaginary, that each party in the heat of controversy attributed to the other views which it did not hold. In some cases also consequences or results to which, it was held, certain premises necessarily led, nevertheless were not endorsed, for men are not always logical in their beliefs. Yet we repeat our conviction that the two sides have drawn nearer together on many important points. They still differ, however, and we have not for once imagined that the peace resolutions of the late General Synod have overcome all these differences or that they will overcome them. They will, no doubt, continue to exist. Theological opinions sincerely formed and earnestly maintained for years cannot be changed at will. They are not like a garment that may be laid aside at any time. Nor do we consider it just necessary for the interest of peace in the Church that they should be suddenly changed. Even were that possible, it is clear that new differences would soon come to take the place of the old ones.

It lies in the nature of man's individuality and his efforts after progress that the subjective apprehension of truth will be various, not uniform. No two persons ever see the same thing in precisely the same light. This is the case in the development of our physical life, and it is so also in our ethical development. Virtue and duty, though one in their nature, become endlessly various in their individual unfolding. No two consciences act precisely alike, no two duties are precisely alike. There are schools in science and art, there are parties in politics, and we cannot expect that men will ever think just

alike in religion. Indeed, in our present state at least, differences and antagonisms seem to be a necessary condition for the evolution of truth. We would not just adopt Leibnitz' optimism, and hold that actual error is necessary to the development of truth in all finite minds; but it is certainly a fact that men grasp the truth only in partial forms, and that antagonism is a law of our present imperfect life. The difference between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches on the subject of the Lord's Supper at the time of the Reformation was not accidental nor without profound significance for the development of this dogma, a significance which, we believe, has not yet been fully exhausted.

But as we shall have occasion to return to this point in the course of our article we proceed to consider the reasons which chiefly weigh in our minds for believing that the peace measure adopted by the late Synod will prove effectual.

We believe that the issues in controversy will be superseded by new questions that must arise and occupy the attention of the Church. It is a law of history that antagonisms are overcome in this way. Where each side reveals a persistent strength, and carries with it a certain measure of truth, the end is seldom if ever the utter destruction of either one. On the mere principle of conservation of forces the new departure must take up into itself and represent the old. This is not what is sometimes understood by compromise, which we have very little faith in where it means a mere external compact according to which each party yields up a certain portion of truth for the mere purpose of agreement. Such compromise when men are earnest only puts off the evil day. But there is another sense in which a compromise is legitimate and lasting, that is, where each party to the antagonism has advanced and are prepared to join in new work or new issues which reduce the relative significance of the old antagonisms.

What now is our present condition as a Church in relation to the long controversy through which we have passed? It is not merely the fact that the controversy has exhausted itself

that prepares us for a new departure. This fact, it is true, exists. The long discussion has exhausted the arguments on both sides. If we take up any of the points in the controversy as they have stood arrayed against each other, it is an admitted fact that nothing new can be said or written on them. The discussion for a long time has only repeated what has been presented over and over again. We mean not that the subjects themselves have been exhausted, but the arguments on them in the particular form of antagonism in which they have been made to confront each other. Who among us can present anything new, for instance, on the question of liturgical over against unliturgical worship? Or who can present any new thoughts on the subject of the sacramental in Christianity in relation to the experimental?

But this fact is merely negative in its character, and would not in itself be sufficient to establish the hope that the day of lasting peace has dawned upon us. This fact must, therefore, connect itself with some positive elements. The relative significance of the old antagonisms must be felt to have lost its significance in the light of new and united work in the Church. And we cannot refrain here from putting on record again a sentiment we have uttered before in regard to the liturgical controversy that has caused such bitter antagonisms. We believe that in the heat of controversy *both sides have attached far too much significance to the form of worship in comparison with what is confessedly more important, the inner life and spirit.* We give neither side an advantage here over the other. A form of worship may be either precomposed or *ex tempore*, written or unwritten, more complete in words and style or less complete, but the acceptableness of the worship depends not on that difference. Now it is a fact that we have been disputing for over twenty years in regard to the manner or form in which we shall offer our worship to the Lord. No matter which side has been more nearly right on this question, the significance of the issue has unquestionably been unduly magnified. May it not be that the Lord has confused our

counsels because we have been expending so much bitter controversy upon the service of the lips and been apparently so little concerned comparatively in regard to the offering of the heart. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts?" Isa. i. 11, et seq. We mean no reflection in this. Reasons may be given for the earnest contention on both sides. It had its meaning in its time. But we think all will admit, now that we have come to a truce in the controversy, that acceptable worship may be offered in either form.

Having reached this conclusion, the solution of the difficulty may come in two ways. We may be prepared to yield what is confessedly not essential on both sides, and unite and produce a liturgy which will be acceptable to the whole Church; or we may allow a certain measure of freedom in the use of different forms of worship. Uniformity here, even if it is claimed to be desirable, is certainly not essential. The primitive Church had different liturgies in different provinces, and they never thought of sitting in judgment on each other in such a matter. We express no preference for either of these courses, because the subject may safely be referred to the judgment of the proposed Commission, and ultimately of the General Synod and the Churches, but we feel sure that we have passed beyond the controversy as it has gone forward in the past twenty years. No power can galvanize it into life again in the old form.

Leaving particular examples, we pass on to consider in a more general way the changed attitude of Christianity, or Christendom, in relation to its daugers and antagonists, which must necessarily give rise to new questions that will just as necessarily absorb former issues.

The new struggle for which the Church is girding itself and putting on its armor is with the titanic onset of unbelief in its most recently developed and most dangerous form, an utter

denial of the supernatural in Christianity. Before this danger former internal differences in the Churches are beginning to sink out of view. The question is no longer between churchism and evangelicalism, high-church and low-church, between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, between liturgical and anti-liturgical worship, nor even between one theology and another, but as never before, between faith in the supernatural world holding in our Lord Jesus Christ, and an utter denial of such supernatural world.

It may indeed be said, this has always been the great issue between belief and unbelief, but the Christian world in all sections most assuredly is beginning to realize the approach of the contest in a new form of Satanic power. In the first age of Christianity, for instance, the contest was mainly between the true religion and false religions. All were religious, and therefore it was only a contest between religions. All believed in what they regarded as a supernatural world;—the struggle was between true faith and false faith. So also in the Middle Ages, the ages emphatically of faith, the question of a supernatural world was not raised in the minds of men. Blind faith there was, and superstition, in abundance, so that, as an eminent Church historian well known to our readers recently remarked to the writer, it would have mattered little to the people whether they had been taught to believe that the whale swallowed Jonah or Jonah swallowed the whale, the one would have been believed as implicitly as the other. But ours is a different age. It has been different ever since the Reformation indeed, but we utter only what is coming to be felt over the whole Christian world when we say the present century, and especially the second half of it, has brought the Church face to face with such an antagonism of unbelief as it has never been confronted with before. It is not necessary to attempt to point out at length the nature of this opposition to Christianity. It is only necessary to notice the burden of sermons in all pulpits, of theological essays and works, and addresses in all great

Church assemblies to see that Christendom is deeply moved by a sense of the danger.

We might also refer to the antagonism on the practical side, in the new dangers that threaten the order of society in every Christian nation on the globe, the general breaking away from former moorings, the socialistic schemes that aim to put down authority and law, the growing contest between capital and labor, and the apparent helplessness of society to meet the evils.

Corresponding to this opposition to Christianity by the spirit of the world, inspired by the realm of superhuman evil, the Church clearly realizes the necessity of readjusting its strength, and in order to do this with true effect it must rise with the occasion above less important issues and questions to concentrate its power against the common foe. At such times minor differences must be forgotten in the great antagonism.

Romanism must certainly receive credit for its wakefulness and watchfulness in seeing the danger. It has sent forth its warning and summoned its great council, the first since that of Trent, when the Reformation shook its foundations. But now as then it aims to conquer by condemning and anathematizing without bringing true relief. Merely to denounce the civilization of the 19th century will not infuse into that civilization a better spirit. Christianity is historical, it is living and active, and therefore it must direct its power in new forms against the new and changed opposition of unbelief.

It is not difficult to see now what we mean in a general way by new questions and new issues that must supersede old antagonisms as they pass away. The principles of Christianity are the same, the principles of Protestantism remain, but the form in which they antagonize the kingdom of evil must determine itself according to the form of attack. All denominations feel this more or less, and we behold everywhere, therefore, a movement to concentrate strength. The leading minds of Europe and America are in communication, the theological and apologetic literature of both continents moves in one common

direction. *New questions and new issues are before the Church at large.* Who would undertake to hold the attention or interest of the Christian public on either side of the ocean now, by a discussion of the exclusive claims of Apostolic succession in the form of episcopal ordination? Or who could now concentrate that attention and interest on a discussion of the five points of Calvinism? Methodism no longer claims the only true method of conversion. Puritanism in its American stronghold applauds one of its own sons who spreads before them the rich treasures of German theology in opposing rationalism. What need is there for further examples to show that new questions are everywhere claiming the attention of the Church? It is equally clear that our own Reformed Church, in sympathy with other Christian denominations, must be affected by the general spirit. Our theology will not stagnate if we cease warfare on the particular questions which we have been discussing for over a quarter of a century. That is the only point we wish here to make. At one time the issues between the Old and New School Presbyterian Churches were considered of vital, all-absorbing importance. The same differences still exist, and full freedom in regard to them is allowed, and yet the one re-united Presbyterian Church is entirely at peace so far as those issues are concerned. We have been led to commence adjusting our differences peacefully before the tension snapped asunder the bonds that hold us in one body. If we had divided we would have had to travel over the same road towards a union again.

The general conclusion to which this train of thought has brought us is that our systems of theology generally in the Protestant Churches will be required to concentrate their strength more on the common essential articles of faith, so as to bring about union on these, while freedom is allowed on minor differences. We need to take home the truth, long familiar to us, that Christianity does not hold essentially in theological doctrine any more than in Church polity. We do not question the importance of sound doctrine as well as living

faith. The historical development of dogmatic theology has rested on a certain necessity in the progress of the Church. Each heresy that has arisen has been met by a corresponding definition and statement of the truth in the way of theological formula. But as each heresy and error has its day and then loses its special power, so also particular doctrinal antitheses have only a temporary special significance.

But Christianity is deeper than doctrine. Even truth is something far more substantial than mere formulas of thought for the intellect. In its objective constitution it stands in living union with love. Truth and love constitute one life. Life entering the will as love and the intellect as truth must be one in man as it is one in its objective constitution. Hence it is easy to see that doctrine does not produce life, but is only one of the forms of its expression, while it also guards it from error. Too much stress may therefore be laid upon doctrine, as well as too little. Perhaps our Church, along with others, has magnified too much the importance of theology. We intend no covert or implied plea for laxness in doctrine, or latitudinarianism, for we concede the importance of sound doctrine as well as righteousness of life.

But we should not forget that the source of grace is, not doctrine, but Christ the Lord through His Word and Spirit. The Word of God is a fountain of life for man in a sense in which theological dogmas are not. It may be said indeed that doctrine comes from the Word and formulates it for our intellectual apprehension. We grant it, but that is not the only nor chief office of the Word of God. Its primary office is to speak directly to man, conveying to the true and believing heart the riches of heavenly grace, the very life of God.

May we not find here a correction of a certain one-sidedness in our intense theological interest? We have contended over theological issues as though the issues of the Christian life and the welfare of the Church depended exclusively on them. And may not this be one of the faults of the Church at large in this age? In the great contest with unbelief may not the Church

feel challenged anew to fall back upon the power and grace of the Word of God which carries in it the very presence of the supernatural world? Not as a natural word for the natural understanding, not as merely furnishing the material for classifying and formulating theological doctrine, but as conveying divine life directly to the soul.

In saying this we are uttering nothing new, for the Church has always recognized such immediate and direct power of the divine Word for all who read it in the spirit of simplicity and faith. But there is reason to believe that the Word of God will yet disclose an internal presence of the supernatural world for the faith of the Church in the power of which it will find the true victory over the great assault of unbelief. The victory here will be found to hold, not in the ability to answer the arguments of infidelity from the Bible on the plane of reason—that may be proper in its place—but rather in this, that the people of God will see, as in spiritual vision, the presence of the supernatural world proceeding from God in His holy Word, and will assert this as their faith over against all unbelief. This after all is the strength of the Church. As the Apostles declared what they saw and heard of the word of life, the great mystery of grace, bearing witness of it before an unbelieving world, and by their unfaltering faith and testimony confounded the wisdom of the wise and gained adherents and followers to the religion of Christ, so the real strength of the Church will be found in its ability to testify to the world the truth and reality of the supernatural world set before them in God's eternal Word.

Without carrying out this thought further, the inference or conclusion we derive from it is, that theological opinions and doctrines should be regarded as of secondary importance as compared with the divine truth that confronts us directly in the Word of God. We might go further and predict that our theological systems generally, which are after all of human production as systems, will have to give way before this direct revelation of the supernatural power and grace of the divine

Word, so that the direct vision of the divine will thus more and more take the place of what has become so largely mere natural rationalistic interpretation of the Bible. But it is sufficient to draw our inference that with this reinstatement of the Bible in the faith of the Church in its full divine character, freedom may be allowed for theological differences without disturbing the true unity of faith and life. This is the point to which our remarks here tend. If it be said that we cannot suddenly modify and change our theological opinions, honestly and earnestly held, and therefore a mere peace resolution can have but little effect, our answer is, diversity of theological opinion within certain limits does not necessarily interfere with the highest and best unity of faith and life. This is coming to be felt in all Churches. Who in the Presbyterian Church now dreams of requiring of its ministry or its membership strict acceptance and endorsement of all the theological phases of thought and doctrine in the Westminster Confession in order to be entitled honestly and fairly to the communion of that Church? Freedom for such differences might, indeed, be merely negative, the result of mere indifference and latitudinarianism, and in that view an evil to be deplored. But when it is allowed and exercised as holding in the essential unity of Christian faith and Christian life in union with Christ through His Word, the case is quite different. Indeed it has already been practically exemplified among us, that with restored confidence these differences are not a bar to Christian love and peace. As Dr. Weiser's paper so pointedly asserts, there were such differences already in the Apostolic Church, and what is more between the Apostles themselves, requiring a Council, not to make them all think alike, but to determine their settlement in the shape of certain practical measures which all could endorse. And yet the unity of the Apostolic Church remained unbroken. Peter could not think and act just as Paul did, and even after the Synod had settled the matter he found it difficult just to fall in with the new order, for which Paul withstood him to the face, because, as St. Paul says, he was to

be blamed. We have no explanation from Peter in the matter, and may infer that he received the rebuke in a proper spirit. But these two great Apostles still labored hand in hand for the spread of the gospel. St. Peter never perhaps understood clearly all the intricacies of St. Paul's theology, for he says of it that it contained some things hard to be understood, as his readers find even at the present day, yet who can doubt that Peter apprehended in the very highest degree that mystery of mysteries which he confessed before Paul was born as yet into the kingdom of grace?

Altogether we have more faith in the permanency of a peace based on freedom than on suppression of freedom. Let confidence be restored and such freedom will work no harm. Difficulties will no doubt arise here and there on the practical side, and in meeting these something will have to be yielded by both parties; but this has already been the case in many congregations for years. These differences in congregations will grow less just in proportion as those who lead in the two tendencies come into reconciliation. Party spirit has unfortunately entered into the contest. When that disappears the people will have no motive to strive for victory, and they will consult each other's wants and wishes.

There is another point which may be referred to as having its weight on the subject under consideration. The Church seems anxious and ready to direct her energies now in the practical work of Church-extension. We do not agree with those who think that theological interest and controversy are hindrances to practical activity in the Church. The history of the last twenty or thirty years, we think, refutes this notion. Still it must be granted that our divisions have served more or less to retard much practical work. The general aggressive enterprises of the Church have not been commensurate with our growing numbers and increasing wealth. The work of missions has not prospered as it should, partly because our efforts have lacked unity. Strife in congregations has caused the spirit of liberality to grow lean and weak.

We have thus presented some of the reasons which influence our mind in concluding that the peace policy inaugurated by the General Synod will prove successful. Others hold the same conclusion for other, and perhaps better, reasons. The main point is that it should receive the confidence of the Church. As we relied much on the preparation that went forward previous to the meeting of the General Synod, so now much will depend on the general spirit of the Church in deciding whether the Commission can expect to be successful in its work. What is especially needed now is that the action of the Synod receive the confidence of the Church. The true principle is, not to withhold approval until we see what the Commission will do, but to have confidence and cultivate beforehand a spirit of reconciliation and charity—not to act on the principle of distrusting each other until our honest intentions are proved, but rather to have entire confidence until we have good reason to believe that it is misplaced. That is the way to inaugurate the new departure of harmony and peace.

We pass to the notice of several other topics of interest that engaged the attention of the late General Synod.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REFORMED ALLIANCE.

An overture was made to the General Synod of Fort Wayne in 1875, inviting it to appoint delegates to attend the Alliance of Reformed Churches in Edinburgh, Scotland. The invitation, by some clerical error no doubt, was couched in such terms as rendered it impracticable for our Reformed Church to accept it, and accordingly the invitation was declined. Having been informed of this error, the Synod at Lancaster considered the subject again and resolved to appoint delegates to the second meeting of the Alliance, to be held in Philadelphia in 1880. Dr. Schaff, who was present, was invited to address the Synod on the subject, and his remarks were listened to with much interest.

Our Reformed Church for some years stood aloof from many of the union movements of the age, believing that they could

accomplish very little for the object in view. Some of these movements have proved their ephemeral character, while others give better promise. While our Church was contending for an independent position, and seeking to build up its own distinctive theology, it was thought best to maintain some reserve in regard to all unionistic movements, especially as there seemed to be a disposition in certain quarters to pass judgment on our orthodoxy and put us under the ban. It was but natural that this should be resisted by a body like ours that holds a Reformation Confession older than those of some Churches that were free to condemn us. But this war too is over; and it is a question whether it would not be better, while maintaining always our self-respect, to change our policy somewhat in this respect and come into closer fellowship with other denominations in the general movements of the age. This alliance of Reformed Churches certainly belongs to us fully as much as any body represented in it. At Fort Wayne we did not like the title it assumed, nor of course the terms that were proposed, viz.: that only those bodies should enter it which held by the *Westminster* Confession. But we have changed our views somewhat since we have seen the spirit of the first meeting, and now believe that the Church of the Heidelberg Catechism should be represented in that Alliance. It has a mission different from that of the Evangelical Alliance, yet not in conflict with that. A consensus of the Reformed Confessions speaks for one great hemisphere of Protestantism. The essential doctrines in all these confessions are of one type. To bring closer together the Churches holding these confessions may be one step towards simplifying a still more comprehensive union in the hereafter. There seems to be reason also for confining the Alliance to those Reformed Churches that maintain *Presbyterian* government. Indeed it is a necessity so far as the Episcopal Church is concerned, which though Reformed in doctrine, has especially since the time of *Laud*, become separatistic and exclusive in relation to all non-episcopal bodies. If the smaller differences are once settled in the large and principal Protestant families, per-

haps it will facilitate a reconciliation of those which are greater. And as Lutheranism, with which our *German Reformed Church* has many national affinities, seems to be growing rather more exclusive than liberal, our proper attraction seems to be rather towards our Reformed sister Churches.

We feel very sure that the time will come when the Episcopal Church in England and America will feel itself compelled to return to its original position which it occupied in its earlier history in the Reformation, when it labored hand in hand with the Reformed Churches of the continent and freely acknowledged the validity of their Presbyterial ordination. It will find its *via mediaz* between Protestantism and Romanism very slippery and dangerous, that it cannot stand on the foundation of reprobation, and will have to fall in with the principle of historical development, or be left in a state of isolation which will prove a state of stagnation and death.

And we believe that when once the Reformed Churches draw closely together, it will be seen and felt that the two great hemispheres of the Reformation, the Reformed and Lutheran, will seek to unite in one common Protestant alliance, if not organic union. Perhaps by that time Protestantism and Romanism may be driven to unite their strength against the common enemy, the last form of the world's unbelief. This may or may not be. Christian history may have a different course designed by the great Head of the Church. Present distinctions and divisions may melt away in some new form of the Church, not by organic union of existing bodies, but by some world-struggle which will gather into one all individual believers. We cannot forecast, as we need not, how the Lord will marshal His hosts for the final victory. But we may rest calmly in the faith that they will all be one, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail to overcome their true, living unity. Meantime we can heartily co-operate in a movement which looks towards a closer union of the *Reformed family*.

We do not know precisely what the title of this Alliance is, but we believe its conditions of representation allow it to be

regarded as a *Presbyterial Reformed Alliance*. Reformed is the generic name and Presbyterian (or perhaps better *Presbyterial*) is the specific title. Whether this is so put down or not, we know now that this is meant, and we need not hesitate, therefore, to co-operate in the movement. Now that German theology is receiving so much favor in all the leading Seminaries of the Presbyterian Reformed Churches in America, as well as in the English-speaking countries across the ocean, we need not fear that we will not feel at home in the Convention to meet in Philadelphia two years hence. As the matter of appointing the delegates was placed in the hands of the President of our General Synod, in consultation with the other officers of the same, we would suggest that in the same way he should arrange to adapt the delegation to the quota to which we may be entitled, by cutting it down if it should prove to be too numerous, and also by filling vacancies should any occur that may need to be filled.

Did our limits allow, we would like to refer to other items that came before the General Synod. We believe that if the spirit of union that prevailed continues to rest upon us, the effect will be apparent in infusing new life into our missionary operations, our Orphan Homes, and our literary and theological institutions. The Mission Boards of the district Synods have indeed been active and efficient, considering the difficulties with which they have had to contend. We would not change the character of their distinctive work. That should remain. But there is still room for unifying the whole work, and giving it additional efficacy, through a spirit and power that shall go out from a headship of the General Synod. Perhaps something like a *Bureau of Missions* established by the General Synod, with one or more officers who could give exclusive attention to this great work, might be desirable, so that in addition to our present local activity, the power of the whole Church might be brought to bear from time to time on special enterprises. With such united effort that would carry with it inspiration from the whole Church we would be able to establish ourselves

in places, such as New York or the South and West, where we are as yet comparatively unknown, without diminishing at all our contributions in other directions. Meantime the present Boards of the General Synod will be able to exert greater influence. It might be worth their consideration whether by the next meeting of General Synod they may not mature a plan which will unify our whole missionary work and bring it into closer sympathy with the General Synod. We believe one small parent Board might have entrusted it the whole interest of missions, foreign and home. We expect now also to see a speedy establishment of a mission in the foreign field. We know the Board has labored faithfully to this end, and their labors in answer to the prayers of the Church must soon be crowned with success.

Taking it altogether the General Synod of Lancaster will long be remembered as a land-mark in the history of our Reformed Church. It possessed great dignity and weight. The representative men of the Church were there. The proceedings were conducted with ability, dignity and order. Unanimity and harmony prevailed. The devotional services were earnest and solemn, and yet spontaneous, free from all mechanical arrangement or artifice. The special half-hour meeting of prayer and praise was a delight to all who attended it and joined in or listened to the hearty German sacred chorals. Pleasing episodes occurred. They have been noticed and commented on in the weekly press of the Church—the meeting of German pastors and elders at *Caernarvon Place*, the residence of that father in Israel, the venerable Dr. J. W. Nevin—the visit of German brethren to the College, their singing in the chapel, their meeting in the tower, and the familiar address of Dr. Schaff.

The personelle of the Synod was goodly to look upon. There were several of the oldest ministers of the Church present. Dr. Nevin and Rev. J. W. Fritchey, editors of our Church periodicals—whose number is growing—of the *Messenger*, the *Kirchenzeitung*, the *Christian World*, the *Guardian*, the *Hausfreund*,

the Sunday-school *Child's Treasury*, the *Mercersburg Review*. There were presidents of Colleges, and professors from Franklin and Marshall, Heidelberg, Mercersburg, Ursinus, leaving several still not represented; professors of theological Seminaries, from Lancaster, Tiffin, Collegeville, and Mercersburg—none, we believe, from the German Theological School in Wisconsin. A mere reference to these serves to show how greatly the educational institutions of the Church have multiplied and grown since the days, in the remembrance of some now living, when the first school of the prophets was started at Carlisle, and of many, when we had the first college at Mercersburg, the little village at the foot of the North Mountain. There were pastors from East and West, German and English, old and young, who had come from their fields of self-denying labor. And last, but not least, there was a body of elders, whose intelligent appreciation of the interests of the Church, whose understanding of the important issues that came before the body, and whose ready ability for speaking on the floor, are not excelled in any ecclesiastical body in the land. And from beginning to end there was not an unpleasant jar in the proceedings. If the harmony that prevailed may be taken as a prophecy of what is to prevail throughout the Church in all her judicatories, institutions and congregations, then we may fondly hope for a reign of peace and prosperity that shall gladden the hearts of all our people and make our Reformed Zion to rejoice and blossom as the garden of the Lord.

In conclusion of this article which is perhaps growing to too great a length in our hands, we may be allowed to say a word for

OUR REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The suggestion was made by several brethren from the West that it would be desirable now to make the **MERCERSBURG REVIEW** an organ for the whole Church. Though its pages have always been open for all, and articles have been solicited from different sections and tendencies, yet it is known that it has been supported in late years by only a portion of the

Church. Is not the present a favorable time to make it an organ for the whole Church? While we would not solicit or encourage articles that would be calculated to open the wounds of old controversies, yet we feel that no harm would result from opening its pages to writers representing both tendencies in the Church. Let the old party lines indeed be obliterated, and yet let whatever theological questions claim attention be freely discussed. We have no authority, of course, to speak for the authority that controls the REVIEW, but without consultation with any one we believe this enlargement and change could be entered upon with great advantage without waiting for the results of the Peace Commission, and that such a step would go far to facilitate the labors of that Commission. And to this end, speaking for ourself alone, much as we are attached to the old name, we would be willing to change it now to what would better suit the more general character suggested. Let it be The Reformed Church Quarterly, or the Reformed Church Review, or Quarterly Review, or some still fitter name if any can be proposed. It is greatly needed by the whole Church, West as well as East. Let the weekly press tell us what they think of the matter, and correspondents through the press. The subject can then be brought before the Board of Publication, and through it to the Synod, and the change be accomplished. Without waiting even for that we shall be glad to receive and welcome articles of a suitable character from any who may be inspired to aid in promoting the peace and prosperity of the Church and in advancing theological and literary culture.

We have thus ventured to write on what may be regarded at this time as a delicate subject. The course of events may prove that we are mistaken in our judgment as to the result of the principal action of the General Synod. If such should be the case we shall consider it no reflection on head or heart to be guided by greater wisdom and change our opinions. Even if the proposed measures for peace fail we shall not lose faith in the ultimate attainment of that object.

ART. II.—THE HISTORICAL COURSE OF THE CONVERSION
OF THE GERMANS TO CHRISTIANITY.

A GENERAL VIEW.

*Translated from the German of Gotthard Lechler, D. D.,
Superintendent and Professor Ordinary at Leipzig,—by
NEVIN H. FISHER.*

From the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," 1876, Heft III.

To him who has experienced within himself the Gospel of Christ as a power of God unto salvation,—who esteems Christianity as the prolific source of moral and spiritual culture,—to him, the questions must present themselves: when did the Gospel reach our forefathers? how did it make place for itself within our ancestral territory? To him, who proposes these questions, one form alone commonly appears, viz.: that of *Boniface* or *Winfried*. But Winfried was neither the first nor the last, who labored as missionary upon German soil. Centuries before him, had Christian congregations existed in Germany,—and centuries passed away after his time, before the Christian became even externally, the victorious and predominant religion in all German lands.

I hope that it will not seem to be as labor unworthily bestowed for us to portray the entire historical course of the conversion of the German nations to Christ. When I say: the *historical* course—I wish to emphasize the fact that that which belongs merely to the realms of fable and of legend will be discarded, and, that I will hold only to the real facts of history and to that which is original and authentically attested. For in this field, pious legend and unhistorical tradition have been freely

active through a long period. For centuries, it had been believed that the Apostle Peter, himself, had sent three men* across the Alps from Rome, who established churches along the Rhine, and occupied episcopal chairs at Treves, Cologne and Tongern. We will lay these—and all other legends quietly aside, as being without any foundation.

If we consult the original testimony, however, concerning the beginnings of Christian faith and life in Germany, we meet with the remarkable fact of the first witness being a Greek, born in Asia Minor, who lived and labored in Southern France: the eminent *Irenæus*, Bishop of Lyons. In his great work against the heretical parties of his day, written towards the close of the second century after Christ, he refers to Christian congregations in Germany, when he says: “Neither have the churches established in the Germanies received another faith, . . . nor those in Iberia or amongst the Celts,” &c.† *Irenæus* points plainly to the existence—not merely of isolated Christian individuals—but also of organized Christian *churches* in both Germanies *ἐν ταῖς τερματίαις*, i. e., on the Upper and Lower Rhine, since these were the Roman provinces officially known as *Germania prima* and *seconda*.

Surely it is not the result of mere chance that the first notice of the existence of Christian churches in Germany comes from Lyons! Without a doubt, the establishing of those churches in the valley of the Rhine proceeded from the valley of the Rhone. The history of civilization shows that in the most ancient times, the beginnings of culture, e. g., the use of bronze, after the stone age, passed from Massilia up the Rhone and then down the Rhine. And now, the Gospel likewise proceeded from Marseilles, up the Rhone and then down the Rhine.

* Eucharius, Valerius and Maternus. Compare the critical investigation by RETTBERG, in his *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (1846). B. I. S. 73 ff.

† IREN. *adv. haereses* I. 10, § 2: *καὶ οὐτε αἱ ἐν ταῖς Γερμανίαις ἴδρυμέναι ἐκκλησίαι ἀλλὰς πεπιστείκασιν, η ἀλλὰς παραδεδόσασιν, οὐτε ἐν ταῖς Ἰβηρίαις οὐτε ἐν κελτοῖς, etc.*

Those congregations of Christians at Vienne and Lyons, were established by Asia Minor, and were of Greek origin. Consequently, the planting of the earliest churches on the Rhine, points back to a Greek source. This fact is brought to view in a remarkable way by the German word "Kirche"; for this word (derived from the Greek *κυριακὴ*, house of the Lord) did not take its way through the terminology of the Latin church as did the words: *église*, *chiesa*, etc., which descended to all the Romanic tongues through the Latin *ecclesia*. The German races must have received the word "Kirche" directly from Greek-speaking Christians and not through the medium of the Latins.* This fact also indicates that the influence of Greek Christendom upon the earliest German churches, must have been the more original, profounder and more effectual one.

But the Christian communication, which proceeded from the valley of the Rhone to that of the Rhine, and which brought into the territories of the latter the seeds of Christianity, was sustained by the stupendous fabric of the then existing Roman Empire. The Rhine lands as well as those of Gaul were merely provinces under Roman rule. The expeditions of legions, peaceful trade, the great world-traffic—all—moved under the protection and within the boundaries of the universal Empire. Imperceptibly had the Gospel of Christ penetrated leaven-like, through the Roman culture, and had extended itself as though by its own inherent power, to the limits of the empire. The Rhine provinces at one time, constituted a part of such boundaries; then the lands of the Southern Danube—called Rhætia and Noricum,—as well as the territory of Southern Germany lying between the Upper Rhine and the upper course of the Danube as far as Regensburg. Upon this ground, in the Roman cities of Cologne, Mayence, Augsburg, Regensburg and others, had Christianity obtained a footing during the first centuries after Christ, down to the time of Constantine the Great. If Irenæus, towards the end of the second century, speaks of

* Compare Rodolph Hildebrand, in Grimm's Deutschen Wörterbuch, Bd. V., S. 791, "Kirche."

established *churches*, we will certainly be justified in maintaining that, at least, certain *individual* Christians might have been found in those parts of Germany which belonged to the Roman Empire, during the *first half* of the second century. But during this period, we must not allow ourselves to think of missionaries, in the peculiar sense of the term. Little, or no, information indeed, do we possess of such during the second and third centuries after Christ, even in other countries and parts of the world. But upon the other hand, we are not able to represent to ourselves in a sufficiently vivid and worthy way, the zeal of the Christians of that period in communicating to others that which had been to them for the forgiveness of sins, for comfort and peace,—or the active intercourse existing between the *churches*.

The first historically authenticated *names* of Christians in German lands, are brought to light by two ecclesiastical assemblies in the years 313 and 314. In the year 313, amongst the Italian and Gallican bishops summoned to Rome by Constantine for purposes of consultation, we also find *Maternus*, from Cologne on the Rhine. And in the year 314, he again appears with his deacon, *Macrinus*, as does also a bishop of Treves, *Agroecius*, at a council held at Arles in the Rhone delta. These are assuredly altogether Roman names, but it must not follow therefrom that the congregations at Treves, Cologne and similar towns, were composed purely of immigrated Romans and not of native Germans.

Whilst the Rhine-land received Christian influences from Gaul, it is plain that the Southern Danube provinces, Rhætia and Noricum, i. e., Eastern Switzerland, together with Suabia, Bavaria and the Germano-Austrian territories received Christianity directly from Italy,—for *these* German countries stood in direct and active communication with Italy and with the centre of government, Rome, by means of a net-work of military and trade roads. At all events, so long as the Roman—the Western—Empire stood, Christianity did not penetrate

farther into the German countries than to the extent that Roman sovereignty and Roman culture did.

But as the Western Empire crumbled into ruins before the repeated invasions of the migrating races of Teutonic descent, Christianity was prostrated upon German soil. The Alemanni, who were unconverted as yet during the fourth and fifth centuries, pressed towards the Roman borders between the Upper Rhine and the Upper Danube: and only because they had possessed themselves of an earlier Roman, and partly Christian, country did the victors experience a manifold, reacting influence, both of culture and of Christian faith. But not until the year 496, when they were conquered by the Franks in the battle at Zülpich, were Christian influences impressed upon the Alemanni to any efficient degree.

Now, however, missionaries appear. Whence did they come? First of all from Great Britain and Ireland.

The first, whom we know more accurately through historical sources, was *Columbanus* with his companions. He was born in Ireland, entered the monastery of Bangor in North Ireland, but about the year 585, he, with twelve monastic brethren passed through England to France. Here he found Christianity fallen into a profound decay—without moral earnestness or energy. Here he preached from place to place, presented an example of pious self-denial and of ascetic exercise of virtue, and established monasteries for the revivification of Christian piety. Columban founded three monasteries (*Anagrey, Luxeuil* and *Fontenay*) amongst the *Vosges* in the kingdom of Burgundy. But court intrigue drove him from Burgundy in the year 610, whereupon he determined to visit Italy. He journeyed beyond the Rhine with his companions, and remained for a time at the Lake of Zürich; then at the Lake of Constance, and finally in the year 613, he turned his steps towards Northern Italy where he founded the famous monastery of Bobbio near Pavia. Here he died in the year 615. Columban himself did not labor as a missionary, but one of his twelve companions, *Gallus*. Gallus was of an independent character

and possessed a zealous spirit. From the scanty information derived from the oldest biography of St. Gallus,* we learn that he, whilst with Columban at the Lake of Zurich, burned down the heathen temple of the Alemanni at Tuggen and threw the idols into the lake; in consequence of which act, his life was endangered and Columban was ignominiously driven away. By way of Arbon on the Lake of Constance, they now proceeded to Pregantia (Bregenz). Here stood the chapel of St. Aurelia, which had however, become desecrated by reason of the relapse of the Alemanni into paganism. They found in it three bronze, gilded idols, which the reverence of the people had placed there. At the command of Columban, Gallus began to preach during an idolatrous festival. He had studied the Alemannian tongue and had so well mastered it that he was enabled to preach in the German language, whilst Columban did not even understand it. But at the conclusion of his sermon, Gallus proceeded to the chapel, seized upon the idols, shattered them against a rock and flung the fragments into the lake. Columban now reconsecrated the chapel and then remained in Bregenz during three years. Upon his departure for Italy, Gallus was unable to accompany him, having been prostrated by a fever; Columban however, held this to be a mere subterfuge and forbade him the celebrating of the mass during his (Columban's) life, under pain of punishment. Gallus was of a fiery spirit, somewhat similar to Farel the Swiss reformer. But he not only fought with Paganism by the shattering of idols, but also by preaching the Gospel and that too, in the native language which he had taken the pains to acquire. In another view, he followed the example of the Apostle Paul, in that he supported himself and also his friends, by the labor of his hands, principally by fishing. He was finally healed of the sickness which had befallen him when Columban was taking his departure, at Arbon on the Swiss shore of the Lake of Constance, after giving himself into the hands of a priest, Willimar. He then sought for a suitable

* "De vita atque virtutibus b. Galli Confessoris" in Pertz' *Monumenta Germaniae historica, scriptores*, T. II.

spot for a hermitage and found it in a wilderness near the river Steinach. Here he had fallen to the ground, whereupon—after offering a prayer—he thrust a cross made of hazel into the earth and hung upon it his capsule of relics; and then proceeded to build a hut for himself, and a small chapel. From these beginnings the monastery and wealthy Abbey of St. Gall arose—a fruitful nursery of Christianity and a central point for the mission to South Western Germany during the first centuries of the Middle Ages. From this centre, chapels, churches and monasteries sprung up here and there through German Switzerland and Southern Germany; a net-work of Christian stations gradually spread over the country during the course of the seventh century. During his later years the Bishopric of Constance was offered (615) to Gallus, but he declined it. In consonance with his fatherly nature he desired a monastery—not an episcopal cathedral—to be the centre of missions. Gallus died somewhere between 630 and 640. Magnoald (St. Magnus) who founded the monastery of Füssen on the upper part of the river Lech, was a disciple of Gallus.

Whilst Gallus was laboring in Southern Germany, individuals, such as Amandus and Eligius, coming from France, established Christian churches amongst the Frieslanders, in Flanders and Brabant.

A mission from Great Britain joined in with the Frankish mission to the Frieslanders. After the end of the seventh century, Willebrord became the apostle to the Western Frieslanders. He was an Anglo-Saxon by birth but received his education in an Irish monastery. Burning with zeal for the conversion of the heathen, Willebrord in 690, journeyed to Friesland accompanied by twelve companions, as was Columban a century previous. He labored partly under Frankish protection and partly amongst the, as yet, independent Frieslanders. In the year 696, he proceeded to Rome when he received consecration as Bishop of the Frieslanders. He fixed his residence at Wiltaburg, the later Utrecht. After almost fifty years' labor he died, very aged, in 739.

Up to this time, Christianity had obtained an entrance into South Germany (Alemanni and Bavarians) through the efforts of missionaries, as Gallus and his disciples, and into North Western Germany (Friesland) through Willebrord and others. Now, for the first time, the Christian mission advanced towards the interior of German territory, towards Hessia and Thuringia. Here WINFRIED (*Bonifacius*) labored. The honorable title, "Apostle to the Germans," belongs to him in no wise in *the* sense; as though he had been the first or only missionary to our Fatherland. For, as far as his labors extended, there were but few districts (on the Edder and the Werra) where the preaching of Christ had not been heard before him. He generally found that the way had been previously prepared for him; but the Christianity he met with was partly of a degenerated type and partly, as yet, engaged in open conflict with Paganism. Winfried gathered together the existing material, organized, vivified and strengthened,—but in the service of Rome.

"WINNFRIDH" (*Bonifacius* was probably his monastic name) was born about 683, in the South Western part of England, of a noble Anglo-Saxon family. He devoted himself to spiritual studies, which he prosecuted at two of the most flourishing monasteries of England, and was consecrated a priest. An impulse arose within him towards missionary labor amongst the people of the continent, kindred of his own nation. In the year 715 he came to Friesland, but finding the people engaged in war at the time, he was compelled to return. Not until 718 did he again visit the continent; but at this time he proceeded directly to Rome, where he devoted the winter to preparation for his mission work. In May 719, he began his return journey to Germany, having been provided with relics and authority by Gregory II. He passed through Bavaria and Thuringia to Friesland. This was a preliminary tour to enable him to observe and study the country and the people. During three years thereafter, Winfried assisted Willebrord amongst the Frieslanders. From 715-722 was his preparatory and edu-

tional period. Now he began his independent efforts in Central Germany, Hessia and Thuringia, from 722-738. He journeyed through Upper Hessia, founded a monastery at Amanaburg (Amöneburg on the Ohm) and preached in Lower Hessia.

Then however in 732,* he again betook himself to Rome, where he was consecrated as *Bishop of the Germans* by Gregory II. With his consecration, he pledged himself to unconditional faithfulness to St. Peter and the Church of Rome.† Germany was to be brought into strict dependence upon the pope and into direct connection with Rome. Winfried passed through France upon his return journey in order to assure for himself the protection of Charles Martel, the powerful Major-Domo. He then turned to Hessia in order to complete his work begun there in 722. At Geismar, near Fritzlar, he felled the oak sacred to Wodan, and by this means, in the presence of a multitude of the heathen, he presented a shattering proof of the nothingness of the gods of German paganism. With the wood of this oak, he with his disciples, built a chapel, which was dedicated to St. Peter. From Hessia he turned Eastward towards Thuringia, which at that time, embraced the territory extending from the Harz Mountains to the Danube, and from the Western to the Middle Elbe. Upon a hill at Altenbergen, near Friedrichsroda, stands a monument of sandstone, in the form of a colossal candelabrum. This memorial was erected upon the spot where Winfried preached his first sermon in Thuringia. At Ohrdruf, a few miles south of Gotha, he founded a monastery, the first centre for spiritual education in Thuringia. In order to gain vigorous material for church and

* This date is manifestly a typographical error in the original, as Boniface visited Rome for the second time, and was consecrated as Bishop, in 723, by Gregory II. (715-731). Translator.

† This pledge forms the basis for one of those important transitional and turning points, which determines for an immense period of time the predominating tendency of that portion of human history, which it affects, be it in religion, philosophy or politics. Compare Neander: Church History; Vol. III., p. 47, &c. Translator.

monastery at once, he made a short visit to his home. Men and women willingly followed his call, e. g., Lull, the first Abbot of the monastery of Fulda, later, the successor of Winfried to the episcopal chair of Mayence; noble women and nuns also came from England and became abbesses in Thuringia and Hessia, Eastern France and Bavaria. The entire Anglo-Saxon church by vigorous participation and assistance in his labors, aided Winfried greatly. The valuable correspondence of Boniface testifies clearly to this fact. Bishops gave him sterling advice, others sent books, clothing, money, a bell.* In short, he was enabled to feel that his labors and experiences upon German soil, were attended by the heart-felt sympathy, the prayers and the active participation of English Christians. Nor were conflicts wanting: but it appears that the opponents with whom he had to do, were for the most part, followers of the ancient British and Irish Churches, married priests, not subject to Roman supremacy. Winfried, on the other hand, regarded the success of his work as being most closely connected with Rome, with the Roman ceremonial and church regulations. After Gregory III. had conferred upon him the office of Archbishop, Winfried again journeyed to Rome in 738, in order to find ways and means for the firm organization of the German church. This work of organization occupied Winfried from 738 to 754. First of all, he established four bishoprics in Bavaria: Salzburg, Friesingen, Regensburg and Passau; then, several in Thuringia and Hessia. As Archbishop of Mayence, he also summoned several synods, in order to establish firmly the ecclesiastical regulations. In the year 744, in connection with Sturm, he founded the monastery of *Fulda*, a prolific centre for the extension of Christianity and a seminary of science and culture. At length, wearying of the—so frequently—little and external details of ecclesiastical government, a longing for the work of his youth—labor amongst the heathen—awoke within him.

* Jaffe, *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum*, T. III. *Monumenta Moguntina*, 1866. Bonifatii et Lulli Epistole, 15, 16, 23, 32, 39, 55, 62, 72, 73.

Resigning the Archiepiscopal helm into the hands of his associate, Lull, and accompanied by a train of priests and monks, he departed from Mayence down the Rhine,—but after arriving in Friesland he was slain by the Frieslanders on June 5, 754.

Winfried was a man of spotless life, not given to empty verbiage, of a thoroughly practical nature, possessed with wonderful power over the minds of men not only in public preaching but also in confidential intercourse, a teacher and practical leader gifted with magnetic powers of attraction, of stern resolution and of regardless energy when dealing with opposers, but also determined to sacrifice himself to his cause; whereby we can easily understand the grateful devotion and unconditional reverence paid him by his disciples, male and female.

Of the Germanic races that of the Saxons now alone remained unconverted. Their possessions extended from the Elbe to the Weser and the Ems, from the North Sea to the Harz and as far as Hessia. This was the last German tribe to yield to Frankish sovereignty, but constituted also the last support of Teutonic paganism, which reigned supreme in the interior of the Saxon territory, down to the time of Charlemagne. Charles regarded the subjugation of the last German race as one of the chief objects of his life. The war that ensued was not a religious war in its beginnings, but had as its object the extension of the Frankish kingdom. But as the Saxon's love for independence found its support in, and derived its sustenance from the national heathenism, their subjugation was not to be attained without Christianization and baptism. Consequently, a religious interest was united with the political, and the *conversion* of the Saxons had to enter into the plan of conquest. So Charlemagne proceeded upon his campaigns, carrying holy relics, and accompanied by priests and monks, whose duty it was to preach the Gospel to the conquered. During his first expedition he destroyed the Irmensul, according to J. Grimm, an immense, sacred tree as was the tree of Wodan at Geismar. Portions of

the conquered territory were at once granted, in fief, to the Hessian monasteries at Fulda and Amorbach, in order to stimulate their zeal in the Saxon mission. Sturm, Abbot of Fulda, labored with signal success, for the conversion of the Saxons. In the event of an insurrection, the missionaries possessed a place of refuge in these institutions. After the year 785, the power of the Saxons was broken; their chief, Widukind, submitted to baptism, and from this time, multitudes embraced Christianity. But it was not until the year 804, after thirty-two years of war, that the conquest was assured and the country quieted. After the haughty spirits had been broken by iron might, and the hearts humbled, the quiet, peaceful impressions of the Gospel did not remain disregarded. And it is a remarkable fact that the sword-converted generation had scarcely passed away, before, towards the middle of the ninth century, the glorious poesy of the *Heliand* (Saviour) burst forth in the old Low-Saxon and Old-German dialects; that poesy in which Christ was enthusiastically sung, with joy and love, as the Head of the nation. Not until several decennial courses later did, in Southern Germany, the weaker Gospel-Book of the monk Otfried of Weissenburg, take its place by the side of the *Heliand*, in the old High-German dialect.

By the year 800, all the *Germanic* tribes within the borders of our Fatherland, was imbodyed in the Church of Christ. But heathenism still remained unbroken through immense stretches of German territory, viz.: those which at that time, were inhabited by *Sclavonic* tribes. Our own Fatherland itself, together with the entire Eastern half of Germany on from the Saale and the Elbe, with Bohemia, Moravia and the Germano-Austrian lands was still of the heathen religion. Missionary attempts proceeding from Salzburg and Passau were fruitless, because that form of Christianity, which the Romish-minded priests endeavored to introduce seemed to the *Sclaves* as synonymous with German sovereignty. A mission now appeared, which did not proceed from the West to the East, but from the East to the West; it came, not from the Latin

church of Rome, but from the Graeco-Byzantine church. The messengers of faith from the latter possess the merit of having labored successfully in Slavonic territory *before* those who came from the Western church.

In the year 863, two Greek monks proceeded into the kingdom of Moravia, from Thessalonica in Macedonia, where the Apostle Paul had established one of the earliest Christian churches in Europe. Thessalonica was at that time, a centre of Grecian science, culture and ecclesiastical affairs. The surrounding nations were of Slavonic descent and pagan in religion, and Thessalonica became the centre for the mission to the Slaves. The brothers, *Constantine* (called *Cyril* at a later period) and *Methodius* were sent as missionaries, in response to a request for teachers made by Rastices, the founder of the Kingdom of Moravia, who had entered into an alliance with the Byzantine Empire. Rastices desired to make his kingdom independent of the Frankish Empire, of the German nation and of Latin priests. These two learned Greeks gathered around themselves a circle of pupils as a nucleus for an order of native priests; they preached Christ from town to town, in the Slavonic language, and baptized all who desired baptism. They translated the Scripture-Lessons from the Gospels into the Slavonic tongue. For this purpose, Constantine invented a Slavonic alphabet, which, from his later name of *Cyril*, is known as the *Cyrillian*. At a later period, they also translated the remaining Bible-Lessons from the Old and New Testaments. Many churches sprang up, and in these churches the services were conducted in the Slavonic tongue; a national Slavonic Church arose. In the year 867, both brothers journeyed to Rome at the invitation of the pope, where *Cyril* died. *Methodius*, however, after receiving consecration as Bishop of Moravia and Pannonia, returned and continued to labor amongst the Southern Slaves.

Cyril and *Methodius* were the last *foreign* missionaries engaged in the planting of Christianity upon German soil. Now begins the period when *native* German missionaries, alone labor

for the extension of Christianity amongst the inhabitants of German territory. But a long time elapsed before an energetic attempt was made to introduce the Gospel amongst the Slaves of Southern and Eastern Germany, the numerous tribes of the Wends.

Anskar is the first, important name amongst native German missionaries. He was born in 801 and died in 865. During his youthful years, when without office or fame, as well as in later life when Archbishop of Hamburg and Hamburg-Bremen, he laid the foundation for the conversion of the Northern tribes; principally in the Scandinavian countries, in the (at that time) Danish Schleswig-Holstein and in Sweden itself. But in as much as he established the first Christian congregations in (the present) Schleswig and Holstein, built the earliest churches and founded the first schools, he is to be regarded not only as the Apostle of the Scandinavians North, but is also to be held in honorable remembrance as a missionary of Germany. He was a man strong in the faith, filled with powerful energy, rigorous and exacting towards himself during his entire life, but at the same time so charitably disposed towards others that the Danish monarch once commended him to Sweden with the words, that he had never before met with such a gentle, good person. It was a result of his indefatigable labors that even during his own life-time, a large portion of the inhabitants of the present Schleswig-Holstein as far as Southern Jutland, was brought to a knowledge of Christ. But not until late, during the tenth century, did the hour arrive for the conversion of those Slaves upon German soil, the Wends, divided into numerous tribes. But the Gospel reached them in company with German supremacy, and this supremacy endangered their freedom and national individuality. Consequently, the entire, national and independent spirit of the Wends stood in opposition to Christianity. It is scarcely a matter of surprise that the Selavonic paganism reasserted itself upon more than one occasion by the Wends rising up in bloody insurrections against the German attempts for their conversion.

King Henry I. achieved victories over the Wends, and to maintain his supremacy he built strongholds in their territory. But Otho I. was the first to proceed further and to promote the *conversion* of the Sclavonic tribes, by establishing bishoprics, beginning in 946; viz.: Havelberg, Brandenburg, Oldenburg in Holstein, finally Meissen, Merseburg and Zeitz, with the Archbishopric of Magdeburg. These episcopal sees constituted mission-posts and at the same time spiritual strongholds for the extension and maintenance of German sovereignty. No Gallus, no Cyril and Methodius, appeared here, who would have taken pains to acquire the Sclavonic language and who would have entered into the Wendish nationality with the spirit of love! And what a hindrance must the usage of a foreign language have been. Otho named Boso, a monk from the Abbey of St. Emmeran at Regensburg, as the first bishop of Merseburg. Bishop Boso contented himself with writing the Latin and Greek forms of prayer in Sclavonic characters, for the Wends of his diocese. He wished them to learn to sing the "*Kyrie Eleison*" as a highly useful and beneficial devotional exercise; but mere mockery ensued. The Wends, instead of these words, began to sing *their* similarly sounding phrase: "*Ukri volsa*," i. e., "The alder stands in the hedge," but they also declared: "This is what Boso said!" But comedy soon gave place to tragedy: in the year 983 a terrible insurrection broke forth in Brandenburg, and, in 1066, at Mecklenburg, for the purpose of casting off the German yoke together with the Christian faith. The churches were utterly demolished, and all traces of Christianity were swept away. Matters progressed more favorably in Meissen and Lusatia, where Bishop Werner of Merseburg and Benno of Meissen labored actively for the conversion of the Wends in their dioceses. Nevertheless, it was not until the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth centuries, that heathenism disappeared from the present Kingdom of Saxony. But paganism reigned unchecked in the countries bordering upon the Baltic Sea, in Mecklenburg, Pommerania and Prussia,

as late as the eleventh century. And, as a rule, Slavonic haughtiness yielded to might alone; conquest and German colonization paved the way for Christianity.

Bishop Otto of Bamberg, the apostle of Pommerania, was one of the few who labored for the extension of the kingdom of God by the preaching of His Word. He was more than sixty years of age when Radislav III., Duke of Poland, who had conquered Pommerania, called upon him to attempt the conversion of the Pommeranians. Otto joyfully responded to this call, and in May 1124, accompanied by many followers, he began his journey, first through Bohemia and Silesia to Poland, and then only, to Pommerania. The spirit of the Pommeranians had been broken and made susceptible for the reception of the Gospel, by their recent defeat and subjugation. This accounts for the success attending the pious Bishop's labors. Otto appeared at once in full episcopal dignity; impressed the Pommeranians by his imposing presence, and won their hearts by his amiableness. No missionary labored amongst the Wends with better judgment and greater love, than did Otto, and he soon gained the affections and confidence of the people. The Bishop preached at Pyritz, four miles from Stettin, and was there enabled to baptize several thousands, as the first-fruits of the mission amongst the West Pommeranians. Now one success followed closely upon another; he destroyed the heathen temples, then journeyed through the Eastern province of Pommerania and in the following year, returned to Bamberg, after having established churches in eight cities. He undertook a second missionary tour in 1128, during which he completed the Christianization of the country. Nevertheless, two entire generations passed away before the Pommeranians, a tenacious people, constituted a Christian nation. Their conversion was only attained by proceeding hand in hand with the Germanization of the country. But the island, Rugen, remained as an unconquered bulwark of Slavonic heathenism, so late as the middle of the twelfth century; a pagan high-priest still officiated in the temple at Arcona. Then, Waldemar I., the Danish king, sub-

jugated Rugen. Bishop Absalom of Roeskilde on the island of Zealand, conquered the sacred city of Arcona, the chief stronghold, in 1168: the temple disappeared in flames, and the first church of Rugen arose in its stead. The Danish priests now began to preach for the first time, and Pommeranian priests consecrated themselves to the task of instructing and baptizing the inhabitants. Cotemporary with Otto of Bamberg, the pious, self-sacrificing *Vicelin*, a man of God, labored amongst the Abodrites, a Slavonic tribe occupying Holstein. Vicelin, however, had to contend with continual hindrances and hardships in his work, down to the time of his death, in 1154. In Holstein, as well as in Mecklenburg, the stability of Christianity was conditioned by the gradual Germanization of the people.

Finally, the conversion of the Prussians was only effected during the thirteenth century. They constituted a Slavonic tribe of Lettian descent occupying the territory between the Vistula and the Memel. It is true, that the holy Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, a native Czech, labored amongst the Prussians towards the close of the tenth century, but he fell a martyr at the hands of a fanatical mob of the heathen, in 997. So also the first *German* missionary to the Prussians, Bruno of Querfurt, with eighteen companions, in 1008. It was not until the year 1209, that the Cistercian monk, *Christian*, of the monastery of Oliva at Dantzic, guided by skillful judgment, succeeded in planting the first seeds of Christianity amongst the Prussians. He but followed the impulses of his heart, when he determined to bear the light of the Gospel into their neighboring territory. He was further qualified by the knowledge of several languages, being able to speak to the Prussians in their own tongue. He labored with favorable success during several years, in the vicinity of Culm, on the Middle Vistula. But now a powerful opposition was stirred up by the native Prussians. Consequently, in 1219, a crusade was undertaken against them, which, at first had only defensive designs in view, but it gradually assumed an offensive form, and finally, in 1231, the Order of German Knights responded to a call to enter the

field. This warfare continued through more than a half century, and the conquest of the country was not completed until the year, 1283, after much bloodshed. Then, castles were built, fortified towns sprung up, peopled by German colonists, and not until then, was the Prussian nation forced, at least to an *external* acceptance of Christianity. But the latter advanced in power over the hearts of the natives only in the degree as German colonization and German culture prepared the way. Even as late as the fifteenth century, much of a pagan nature still existed in Prussia, and it was left to the Reformation to bring the Christianization of the people to a point of stability.

If we again glance through the course which the conversion of the Germans to Christ, has taken, we will see :

1. That it was a long path, extending through more than eleven centuries. German missions began as early as the second century, for at the close of that century Irenæus speaks of Christian churches established in the Germanies, i. e., in the Rhine-lands. And when did the mission to Germany complete its work? Not earlier than towards the end of the thirteenth century, as it was not until that time, that the church of Christ became firmly established in East Prussia. It occupied the German mission, eleven full centuries in covering the German provinces with a net-work of Christian establishments, and in Christianizing the natives from the South Western to the most remote North Eastern portions of the country. I will merely refer to the deduction from this fact, so closely related to ourselves, viz., that we should not judge too precipitately concerning the results of missions in our own day.

2. That the extraction, nationality and religious posture of the missionaries, were of the most varied character. They came from all parts of the world, from the most diverse countries. The first must have entered the Rhine provinces from France; the Southern Danube countries from Italy, consequently from the West and the South. At a later period, Columban, Gallus and others came from Ireland; Willebrord,

Winfried and others, from England: consequently from the North West. In the ninth century, Cyril and Methodius, the Slavonic apostles, came from the Byzantine Empire, from the South East. Directly from the North came Bishop Absalom from the island of Zealand, to the island of Rugen. Thus, we see that the missionaries of Germany came from all directions of the world.

And just as varied were also the nationalities and ecclesiastical circles from which they sprang. Those Christians which came from Italy and Gaul, we naturally regard as Romans, or Romanized provincials, although Greeks were also certainly engaged in bearing the Gospel from Lyons into the Rhine provinces. Those who came from Ireland were of Celtic extraction, but they were altogether known in Germany as "Schotten" (Scots); I recall the "Schottenklöster" which were found in many German towns. Willebrord, Winfried and others were Anglo-Saxons, who felt themselves drawn towards the Frieslanders, Saxons and Thuringians of the continent, by reason of the national relationship existing between their own and these races. Cyril and Methodius belonged to the Byzantine-Greek nationality and church. And the later missionaries were Germans themselves. This extraordinary diversity of national and ecclesiastical character of the individual bearers of Christianity to us, was providential,—it was to assist fundamentally in stamping upon German piety and Christian culture, the feature of universality.

Finally, 3. That not until their conversion to Christianity, did the German races become inwardly united. A particularistic feature pervades us Germans. The Franks, Alemanni, Saxons and others represented distinct races in themselves. It remained for the Christian faith to unite the individual tribes and to fuse them into *one* nation. Further, the Gospel became for the Germans, the seed from which, grew as fruit, moral culture, and also science and art. Yes! the Reformation itself, with all the acquisitions of Protestantism, is only one fruit of the Gospel-seed scattered upon the susceptible soil of the Ger-

man nature and national life. What do we glean from this? Answer, that we, so surely as the unity of the German nation is dear and precious to us, and so surely as we prize the treasures of culture, science and art, that, so surely, must we remain faithful to the Gospel of Christ, Himself, our dear Lord and Saviour. For if the kingdom of God becomes lost to us, all things else will fall away, and the opposite of the Word will become true for us, viz.: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." Wherefore, "hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown."

ART. III.—THE PIONEERS OF GERMAN LITERATURE IN AMERICA.

BY PROF. JOS. HENRY DUBBS.

We propose to make a brief excursion into the realm of Literature. It is a region in which there are many travelers, but most of these insist on journeying along broad highways, where thousands of laborers have hardened the earth for their feet. No work of art can attract their attention unless it bears the signature of an acknowledged master; no scene, however lovely, can win their praise, unless it is renowned in history and song.

We desire on this occasion to enter one of the by-ways of Literature, to visit an obscure valley and commune with its simple-hearted inhabitants. Though we cannot promise to show you any sights of imposing grandeur, we will probably find some rare flowers growing along our pathway—we may perhaps behold some scenes of sylvan beauty which the ordinary tourists fail to discover.

The Pioneers of German Literature in America furnish a theme for our meditations, which for me has always been pos-

sessed of the most fascinating interest, and which cannot be entirely indifferent to the many sons of German sires among my present audience.

It is but recently that the transcendent excellence of German Literature has come to be generally acknowledged. The sound of the great names of Goethe and Schiller had indeed been heard far beyond the boundaries of their native country; but the time is almost within my recollection when American students first began to direct their attention in real earnest to the broad domain of German literature and science. It required the labors of a Bulwer, a Carlyle and a Longfellow to convince the average Anglo-American of the existence of a Continental literature worthy of his study; but the result must have far exceeded the anticipations of these distinguished translators. The subject has actually become fashionable, and in our literary circles the names, at least, of the *Nibelungen* and the *Heldenbuch*, of the "Minnesinger" and the "Meistersänger," are hardly less familiar than in the ancient "land of oaks" itself. The statecraft of von Bismarck and the sword of von Moltke have no doubt added greatly to the political importance of Germany, but it is not by such means that she has gained her surest title to the reverence of the nations. What Longfellow said of the quaint old city of Nuremberg may as well be said of the whole country, from the Baltic to the Adriatic:

"Not thy councils, nor thy Kaisers, win for thee the world's regard,
But thy painter Albrecht Durer and Hans Sachs thy cobbler bard."

The history of Literature has recently been studied with the most careful minuteness. The Germans have elaborated the subject with their proverbial industry, so that the mere titles of the works they have produced, on this single theme, would easily fill a volume. In this country, though we have no such stupendous literary collections, our Cyclopædias of American Literature give us an abundance of information concerning every American author of any eminence, who wrote in the English language, from the days of Anne Bradstreet and the

authors of the Bay State Psalm Book to those of Bret Harte and Joaquin Miller.

Under these circumstances it may appear almost presumptuous to assert, that there lies between the literature of Germany and that of America a certain debatable ground—a patch of *unpatented land*, our fathers might have called it—which though sufficiently fertile has neither been accurately surveyed nor properly cultivated. But where, we might ask, is the author either in Europe or America who has given us any systematic account of those sturdy pioneers, who in the midst of difficulties sought to transplant the literature of the Fatherland to the virgin soil of their adopted country?

A distinguished German has said :

"Willst den Dichter Du verstehen,
Musst in Dichter's Lande gehen."

You must learn to understand the circumstances by which an author was surrounded before you can fully appreciate his work. Let us then attempt to form some conception of the condition of the Germans of Pennsylvania one hundred and fifty years ago.

It is not necessary that we should relate the oft-told story of the French invasion of the Palatinate. It will be remembered that it was the avowed intention of Louis XIV. to prevent future collisions between France and Germany by transforming the valley of the Rhine into an uninhabited desert. Again and again, French armies under Turenne, Montchas and Melac swept the valley with the besom of destruction—they cut down all the vines on the hill-sides of Heidelberg; they forced the miserable Palatines to plow up their growing corn; they destroyed the city of Mannheim and dragged its blackened ruins into the Neckar. The neighboring princes, quarreling among themselves, left the unhappy Palatines to their fate, in the hope of thus escaping the misfortunes that had befallen the Elector of the Rhine. These little German princes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—where can we find language to depict their vileness? Robber-barons at heart, like their mediæ-

val ancestors, they had been suddenly raised by the terms of the treaty of Westphalia, to the ranks of independent princes. Too weak to injure others, they began to exercise their newly found authority by persecuting the inhabitants of their own beggarly principalities. The Margrave of Anspach, who is called by way of charity "the Insane," amused himself by shooting laborers from his palace window, to prove the accuracy of his aim. Princes who had themselves apostatized from Protestantism, murdered their subjects because they were too honest to follow their example. It is possible that a lingering feeling of respect should accompany the horror with which we regard a thorough bigot, like Torquemada or Philip II., for these men were at least honest in their mistaken zeal; but for a miserable renegade of a German prince, who could sacrifice his subjects for no better reason than to show that he could do such things as easily as his betters, we have no language to express our loathing and contempt. *Basta! Grand-Duke of Geroldstein-Pumpernickel.*

Is it surprising that many of the Protestants of the Palatinate should have left their fatherland? Is it not rather wonderful that any should have remained there to suffer or to die? By tens of thousands they hurried down the Rhine, some of them to subsist for a while on the charity of the people of Holland, others to dwell in tents by the sea-side until their little savings were exhausted; then to be transported to England, whose good queen ANNE had offered them an asylum, and finally to be huddled into ships and sent to distant colonies. Nor were their troubles ended when they had arrived at their destination. There was no hope for them but in reclaiming the wilderness, and that was certainly no easy task. Their settlements at first seemed doomed to destruction. At Cote d'or, in Louisiana, and at Mobile they died of fever; in North Carolina they were massacred by the Tuscarora Indians; but in Pennsylvania they struggled on in silence and in hope, until they grew comfortable in the possession of rich lands and pleasant homes. The news of their prosperity soon brought others of their country-

men, who were able to pay their way, and in many instances to purchase the farms and buildings of their English and Irish predecessors. So extensive was this immigration that even the judicious Logan compared it, in a letter which has been often quoted, with the Saxon invasion of Britain; and anticipated the time when the Germans would give Pennsylvania its laws and language.

It was hardly to be expected, that a whole community should have passed through trials such as those we have endeavored to depict, without a marked change in their disposition and modes of thought. In a few years a light and joyous people had become gloomy and sad. They had been taught by bitter experience that we have here no continuing city. Is it strange that they should have been ready to listen to every charlatan who claimed to be the bearer of a celestial revelation?

Though our German forefathers were humble, they were by no means ignorant. There were very few among them who could not at least read and write. How could it be otherwise with the descendants of the men who discovered the art of printing, and to whom the world is especially indebted for the blessings attendant upon the revival of letters?

At first the books they read were necessarily few in number; but it may be confidently asserted that, besides the Sacred Scriptures, they loved no books so well as those of Philip Jacob Spener, who has been called the Lutheran Reformer of the 17th century, and of Jacob Boehme, the inspired shoemaker of Gorlitz.

Among the earliest settlers of Pennsylvania there were many who represented the broken fragments of the Anabaptists of the 16th century, and the writings of Menno Simon and Dietrich Philips were read by multitudes of devout adherents. New sects sprang up in every direction, many of which have fortunately passed away. In Oley, Berks County, there was a sect called the New Born, who held that in consequence of their regeneration they were exalted far above the requirements of the moral law, and, indeed, many of them en-

deavored to prove their exalted spiritual condition by doing precisely what the law of God prohibits. Another sect called "The Inspired," insisted that every word they spoke was the direct result of Divine inspiration. The grave Gichtelians taught, in great part, the system now known as that of Swedenborg, when Swedenborg himself was still a boy at school; while the ranting Labadists in every hamlet in the land announced "the speedy terrors of the Lord." In 1719 Alexander Mack arrived in this country with his band of seven, who in answer to prayer had received a key to unlock the secret sense of Scripture, and here they organized the community which is now known as *Dunkers*, or German Baptists. Everywhere men felt a longing to escape from a world that was doomed to speedy destruction. Hermits dwelt in caves or in the midst of trackless forests. Convents were built by the "Society of the Woman in the Wilderness" at Wissahickon, by the Seventh-day Baptists at Ephrata, and by the Labadists at Bohemia Manor, in Maryland; and admission to one of these institutions was a boon which many craved but comparatively few received.

It is during this mystical period—before the reaction indicated by the organization of the Synods of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches—that we discover the beginnings of German Literature in America. Short treatises had indeed been written here and sent to Germany for publication, and Pastorius, Whittier's "Pennsylvania Pilgrim," had filled huge folios, which still remain in manuscript to puzzle antiquarians.

John Peter Zenger, in 1726, established a German press in New York, printed a few pamphlets, and a few years later began the publication of a weekly journal. For his strictures on the public acts of Governor Cosby, he was imprisoned and tried for libel. The celebrated Andrew Hamilton, of Philadelphia, Attorney General of Pennsylvania, defended him on the ground of the truth of the publication—a principle which has since been well established—and the jury notwithstanding the direction of the bench, brought in a verdict of not guilty. Zenger's

trial had great political significance, and is one of the most celebrated in our colonial history.

It was in the year 1730, the very year in which the Philadelphia Library was founded, that Benjamin Franklin, printer and post-master, received a visit from a delegation of Germans, wearing long beards and dressed like Capuchin monks, who commissioned him to print a German Hymn-book. This was no small undertaking in those days; but "Poor Richard" was not the man to neglect an opportunity of turning an honest penny, and he succeeded in completing the work during the same year, though it is not surprising that its typography should not have been greatly to his credit.

The book itself was a small 12mo., consisting of mystical poetical compositions, principally produced by Conrad Beissel and other members of the curious Baptist sect which, as we have seen, had a few years previously founded a monastic establishment at Ephrata in Lancaster County. They seem to have been very fond of this kind of work, for in 1732 and 1736 they issued two similar volumes, which if not possessing a high order of literary merit are at least curious as expressing their peculiar chiliastic views and aspirations.

The activity of these Ephrata monks during the colonial period was certainly wonderful. Having in 1742 imported a press from Frankfort on the Main, they proceeded to manufacture ink and paper, and produced in rapid succession a series of volumes—about twenty-five in number—principally devoted to the propagation of their peculiar tenets. The titles of these books are generally so sweet as to cloy upon our modern taste. Such are "The Song of the Solitary and Forsaken Turtle Dove," "The Pleasant Odor of Roses and Lilies in the Valley of Humility," and the "Miraculous Melodies of Paradise." More important from a literary point of view were a translation of Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," a history of the order, called "Chronicon Ephratense," and a formidable folio entitled, "The Bloody Scaffold or Baptist Martyrology."

Neither Franklin nor the monks of Ephrata could, however,

retain a monopoly of German printing in America. The time had come for the establishment of a publication-house that could meet the more general requirements of the German community. This want was fully met by Christopher Sauer, *Senior*, who in 1735 began the publication of a German newspaper, and in 1739 founded at Germantown the most extensive printing establishment in the colonies. In 1743 he published a German Bible, the first ever printed in this country in a European language. It will be remembered that the Bible was not printed in America in the English language until 1781, when the work was performed by Robert Aitken, with the pecuniary assistance of the Legislature of Pennsylvania.

Sauer at first felt the warmest sympathy for the monks of Ephrata, and his first publication, which was issued in their interest, was entitled, "Zion's Hill of Incense." One day, however, an event occurred which very materially changed the character of his sentiments. His wife suddenly left him and entered the convent at Ephrata, and it was generally believed that she had been persuaded by the leaders at Ephrata to take this step in order that they might the more easily secure her husband, who would have proved a valuable acquisition to their order. It was probably about this time that Sauer reached the conclusion that though a little mysticism may be wholesome, it becomes dangerous when taken in extraordinary doses. It is pleasant to be informed that, mainly through the influence of her son, *Frau* Sauer returned to her husband, a short time before his death, in 1758.

We have now reached the second period of our German Literary History. As is usual the turning-point is indicated by a cluster of important events, each one of which might be made to serve our purpose as a historical epoch. The arrival of Zinzendorf, in 1741, which resulted in the withdrawal of the Moravians from the alliance known as the "Congregation of God in the Spirit;" the arrival of Muhlenberg, in 1743, and of Schlatter, in 1746; and the subsequent organization of the Reformed Synod, in 1746, and of the Lutheran Ministerium in

the following year, all indicate a reaction from the mysticism of the earlier period, and a willingness to return to more robust and ancient forms of faith. For our present purpose it is enough to direct our attention to the fact, that, in 1744 Christopher Sauer, *Senior*, transferred his publishing interest to his son, who bore precisely the same name, and is therefore frequently mistaken for the father. He was a man of great energy, and in a short time built up a publishing-house which, according to Drake, the principal Boston authority on such subjects, was, "during his life-time and for many years afterwards, the leading establishment of the kind on the American continent." Nearly two hundred different volumes bear his *imprimatur*—books published in the interest of every conceivable sect and party; books on medicine, on magic and necromancy—almanacs in vast profusion—in short, anything that might be expected to have a ready sale. It was not a high order of literature, to be sure, but it was at least equal to that issued in the English language in other portions of the colonies. For upwards of thirty years Sauer maintained the prosperity of his house, exerting an immense influence on his countrymen by his able periodicals. In 1763 he reprinted the Bible first issued by his father. In 1776 a third edition was printed, but many of the sheets having been seized and made into cartridges at the Battle of Germantown, it has now become exceedingly rare and is known as the "Cartridge Bible."

It may be well to mention in this connection, that Sauer is generally regarded as the inventor of cast-iron stoves, and was certainly the first to introduce their use. He also engaged very extensively in type-founding, and the celebrated house of Johnson & Co., of Philadelphia, is said to be directly derived from that of Christopher Sauer.

The last years of this Pioneer of Literature were full of sorrow. During the Revolution he was so liberal in supplying the necessities of our starving militia that he was known as "Der Brod-Vater," or Bread-father; but as he was a Loyalist, and exerted his extensive influence in favor of the Crown, his

property was confiscated, and he died in poverty and obscurity. One of his sons, a third Christopher Sauer, made an effort to retrieve the fortunes of his house, but could never raise it to the degree of prosperity which it had once enjoyed.

Besides the Sauer family there were many others in those days who were industriously engaged in the publication of German books. Unwilling to suffer this important trade to pass entirely out of his hands, Benjamin Franklin, in 1749, formed a partnership with John Boehm, and printed several volumes, among which was an edition of the favorite devotional book, Arndt's "Wahres Christenthum," with fine steel engravings, probably the first of their kind ever executed in America. Among the other German printers the most prominent were probably Crellius, Arnbruster, and Henrich (not *Heinrich*) Miller, in Philadelphia, and at a somewhat later period Bailey & Co., and Lahn, Albright & Stumer, in Lancaster. Miller published the sermons of Rev. John Conrad Steiner, and appears to have been the favorite publisher of the German Reformed ministers of that day; but it must not be forgotten that many of our best writers sent their manuscripts to the Fatherland, to be published there. This was especially the case with the Lutheran, Reformed, and Moravian missionaries, whose reports as printed in Europe formed large and interesting volumes. In this connection it would also be unjust to pass unnoticed the poetical compositions of Helmuth and Kunze, and the scientific labors, at a somewhat later period, of Muhlenberg the botanist and of Melsheimer the entomologist. Our sketch of the pioneers of this early period would also be manifestly incomplete without some reference to its educators.

We have seen that the early German settlers were an intelligent people. With the exception, perhaps, of several minor sects, they believed that true education could never be sundered from religion, and wherever zeal and sacrifice could accomplish it, they built a Church and school-house side by side.

It was, however, but natural that the second generation should be less intelligent than the first. There were no oppor-

tunities of higher education, and the Germans could not afford to follow the example of the more wealthy Virginians in sending their sons to Europe to be educated. There can indeed be no doubt that there was much ignorance in Pennsylvania, as there is in all new countries, and it is to the credit of Muhlenberg and Schlatter that they should have appealed to their friends in Europe to assist them in advancing the intellectual condition of their people. Schlatter was particularly active in this matter, and when he visited Holland in 1751, his published appeal was couched in the most tender and affecting terms. His statement of the case was certainly sufficiently minute, but the subject was taken up by two English clergymen who published additional appeals—drawing from their imagination a fearful picture of a people fast relapsing into barbarism—all this, let it be remembered, at a time when this very people was printing more books than all the rest of America combined. The effect of these appeals in Europe is indescribable. In a very short time a sum amounting to about \$100,000 was subscribed for the purpose of establishing schools among the Germans of Pennsylvania. The king of England contributed \$10,000 from his private purse, the States General of Holland gave \$12,000, and even the half-starved Palatinate sent its little gift of \$300. The services of Michael Schlatter were secured in the capacity of General Superintendent; charity-schools were founded in Lancaster, York, Reading, and several other places; and for a time it seemed as though the objects of the generous donors would be fully realized.

It soon, however, became apparent, that political motives were largely mingled with this charity. The majority of the Trustees belonged to the gentry, in the old English sense of the word—they drove their coach and four, with footmen and outriders; and the Germans who sent their children to these schools, though they were expected to contribute liberally to their support, were made to feel most keenly that they were regarded as the recipients of an unmerited charity, in return for which they ought to yield unquestioning obedience to all the

measures of the British crown. When they showed their unwillingness to be led in this way, it was boldly asserted that the Germans were a dangerous element, which by uniting with the French might easily drive the English from the country. A dignitary of the crown wrote a letter, which was published in London, in which he solemnly asserted that there were Germans in Pennsylvania "so profoundly ignorant as to be unable to express themselves intelligibly in the English language"—a reflection which might as well have been cast upon the learned Corderius himself. Finally, a petition, universally believed to have been written by Provost Smith, the Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Charity-schools, was sent to London requesting parliament to pass a law depriving all Germans of the right of suffrage until they could speak English; appointing English clergymen to minister in the German churches; and forbidding the publication of any German book or periodical unless accompanied by an English translation. Is it surprising that under such circumstances the Charity scheme should have become unpopular? Sauer called it in his paper "a trick and a snare, called into existence by exaggerated reports of the ignorance of the Germans, dishonorable to those who made and believed the reports, and dishonoring those to whom they pertained." The ministers of the Reformed and Lutheran churches continued for a while to support the charity-schools, fully believing that the endowment belonged of right to their people, and should not be diverted from its original intention; but the people were aroused, and holding public meetings every where, almost unanimously determined to have nothing to do with this charity-money. "It was," says Dr. Harbaugh, "in a measure at least a just indignation; and we feel disposed to blame the Germans somewhat for a lack of humility, and then to praise them more for their manliness and sense of honor. The Germans have been ignorant in some periods of their history, and so have all other nations; but less perhaps than all others have they been children, that could be bribed with small gifts and favors, or slaves ready to be sold to the highest bidder, to serve

those who desired to use them for the purpose of fortifying themselves in position and power."

The Charity-scheme thus proved an utter failure, whose disastrous effects were felt for generations. The Germans were represented at home and abroad as obstinate as well as ignorant, and in consequence of their bitter experience, their leading men did not venture to propose another scheme of general education. The few Germans who received a classical education, generally studied at the institution at Philadelphia, now called the University of Pennsylvania, in whose charter the interests of the German population are specially recognized. In the mean time the charity-fund appears to have remained unclaimed in the hands of the Trustees, and its final appropriation is a profound mystery. It is, indeed, a curious fact that large sums of money sometimes disappear by invisible channels. Let us be satisfied with the judgment of Dr. Harbaugh: "those who had control of the fund, no doubt, found some more promising object to which to apply the capital."

It was not until the first years of the third period, which may be regarded as beginning with the American Revolution, that renewed efforts were made in the cause of higher education among the Germans. In 1785 the Moravians established their celebrated school at Nazareth, and two years later Franklin College was founded in the city of Lancaster. The latter institution was inaugurated with a great flourish of trumpets under the auspices of the great Benjamin Franklin himself; though, so far as we know, without any considerable endowment, except a large quantity of wild land, which became valuable in time, but which for many years afforded but a trifling revenue. It is however remarkable, that the institution numbered among its earliest professors a number of distinguished men, whose names would do credit to the records of any college in the land. Among these were Muhlenberg, the botanist, who was the first President; Melsheimer, the entomologist; James Ross, the author of a well-known Latin Grammar, and Wm. Reichenbach, a distinguished mathematician and prolific writer.

We regret that neither time nor the requirements of our theme will permit us to trace the curious history of Franklin College to the time of its union with Marshall College, which was itself an institution established in the special interest of a German community. Having undertaken to speak of the *Pioneers* of German Literature in America, we also refrain from referring to the German authors and publishers who flourished at a period later than the adoption of our Federal Constitution, though their literary productions might literally be numbered by thousands. Many of these were the productions of men liberally educated in the Fatherland, and though possibly printed at rural establishments, to be hawked about the country by itinerant pedlars, are worthy of the careful study of the literary historian.

We have not spoken of that higher order of Literary Pioneers who have been recently engaged in imparting to American minds the rich treasures of German Theology and Science. That there are such "Pioneers" in our very midst is the subject of our constant congratulations. If we have not referred more fully to their achievements it is because their fame is secure, and when they have passed away, worthier hands than ours will do justice to their memory. Our task has been, like that of another "Old Mortality," to attempt to restore a few inscriptions on the tombstones of a forgotten generation.

We have sought to correct a mistaken impression. It has been very generally supposed that Pennsylvania was in its earlier days, at least, a sort of Boeotia, given over to hopeless ignorance, and heartily despising literature and art as proper works of the devil. The facts of the case will, we think, hardly warrant such an impression. The wonder is not that the German pioneers did so little for literature, but that in their poverty and isolation they were able to accomplish so much.

That the names and achievements of our ancient pioneers should have been generally forgotten is in one respect a matter of very little importance. It is

"Enough to know that through the winter's frost
And summer's heat no seed of truth is lost,
And every duty pays at last its cost."

We have spoken of the past in the hope of encouraging our young men to nobler efforts and achievements. Shakspeare says:

"Self-love is not so vile a sin
As self-neglecting."

Let the sons of German sires learn to appreciate their birth-right and its obligations, and they will soon take their place in the front rank of American scholars; they will send back to the noble old Fatherland rich treasures of Literature and Science; and on both sides of the broad Atlantic, in the Literature of two of the grandest nations of the earth, their names will shine with equal splendor,

"Like captain-jewels in the carcanet."

ART. IV.—THE BIBLE AND MODERN SCIENCE.

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, &c.—2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

BY REV. JOSEPH E. SMITH, DD., WILKESBARRE, PA.

IT is not my purpose to give a dissertation upon the inspiration of the Bible. My design is simply to offer a few general thoughts that may go to prove the Bible to be the word of God to men. The subject is many-sided and all but exhaustless. Each age has its doubts and is prolific of difficulties, that, to the skeptical of that age, seem to be insuperable. I shall address myself to the examination of a few of the grave difficulties offered by modern science in disproof of the inspiration of the Bible. Difficulties that, as it seems to me, must affect the thinking of the present time. Literally, the word scripture means writing, but throughout the Bible its use is confined to those books included in what is called The sacred canon, i. e. the books accepted by the Church as a revelation from God. Inspiration means an inbreathing. The doctrine of the text, then, is that there was a supernatural influence imparted to the minds of the writers of the sacred books, by which they were enabled to communicate God's will to men, without error or mistake. This is unquestionably the claim of the book itself; but, is the claim correct? Are its credentials such as should settle all doubts? May it not have been the work of men who were deceived or deceivers? I need not tell you that this is a question of the very highest importance. If this be not a revelation from God, then has He given no written revelation to man. Then, if there be a God, has He left man to his own

reason and to the uncertain teachings of nature. It is true that other books exist that, equally with the Bible, as we are told, claim to be a Divine revelation. The Mohammedan has his Koran; the Brahmin his Veda; the Buddhist his Pitkas; the Scandinavian his Eddas; the Zoroastrian his Avesta; and the Chinese the writings of Confucius. But it requires but a slight knowledge of these writings to see that they contain contradictions and absurdities that could never have emanated from an all-wise God; and teachings in morals that set at defiance all our ideas of purity and holiness. The Christian Scriptures alone deserve by way of pre-eminence to be called *The Bible*—The Book. Here is a book that stands out forever separate from all other books of time. Written upon subjects the most momentous and absorbing, without apparent effort, and in a style at once simple and sublime. Containing the earliest of histories, the first of biographies, the purest and most marvelous doctrines, the sweetest poetry, the grandest diction, the deepest pathos to be found on earth. Though written in ages of comparative darkness, it stands, merely as a literary work, peerless in this age of rarest culture. Written by different persons, in different and distant lands, its writings reaching across a distance of more than a thousand years, and yet forming a unique and complete whole, without a contradiction, and as I claim, without a doctrinal mistake. This is indeed marvelous. But this is not all.

It has proven itself to be precisely adapted to the wants of man in whatever condition of life he may be placed. Here it uplifts the lowly and degraded, and there it humbles the proud. Here it gives strength to the weak, there it adorns the throne of power with the gentleness of a woman and the purity of the saints. Here it inspires with confidence, there it restrains with fear. In a word, it is just what you need. Whatever you need a revelation should be, that is it to you. Do you yearn for light amid a rayless night of gloom? this is the magic wand that rolls back the curtain of darkness and ushers in the light of a glorious morning. Do you feel the pinchings of want? this

is the golden key that fits the intricate wards of God's exhaustless treasure-house and makes you possessor of eternal riches. Do you walk an earth made barren by disappointment, swept of its last oasis by the pitiless storms of malice and persecution? this is the power that robes the earth with vernal beauty, strews again the path with undying flowers and cheers the soul with ceaseless song. Does your heart ache because of bereavement? Does every hope seem delusive, every earthly promise a hollow cheat, the open grave mocking the soul's anguish by its relentless claims? this is the celestial telescope that brings to view the spires and domes, the crowns and mansions, the robes and harps, the shout and song and companionship of that land where the tear never falls and the farewell is never heard.

My brethren, men have long sought for the philosopher's stone—a stone that would transmute trash into purest gold. I clasp the Bible, and holding it up in the face of an unbelieving world, I cry "Eureka." What do you demand of that stone? Is it to transmute tears into heavenly jewelry? that every fire shall purify, that every pain shall enlarge our heavenly domain? Is it a something that shall give strength for weakness, joy for sorrow, peace for turbulence,—transform the earth into a paradise regained, that shall lift and illumine it till it becomes the vestibule of heaven? If this meets the demand, then indeed have I found it. I am aware there are those who will call this mere rhapsody—the special plea of my profession. Men may say I am bound to make good the claims of the book at any cost; but that such claim can only be made at the expense of either my honesty or my intelligence. I stand at the bar of reason. The time is past, and for one, I rejoice in the fact, when grave questions can be settled by the dictum of an ecclesiastic. Much as I reverence the Bible, dear as is to me, its history and doctrines, its warnings and promises, yet, if it is unable to maintain its claims at the tribunal of unprejudiced reason, then, in the name of the God of reason, let it go. Let its history be a myth, its doc-

trines a sublime speculation, and its system of warnings and promises but the utterance of a dreamer. Turn your eye steadily upon the facts, and one truth, at least, will be admitted; that is, the history of this book has been a strange one. Could it be written, it would surpass the wildest dreams of fiction. Its conflicts have been perpetual. Its dangers have seemed continuous; its escapes often miraculous. Once, under the old dispensation, there seemed to be but a single copy extant, and that was long forgotten and buried beneath the rubbish of the temple. Once, under the new, it was banished from the haunts and homes of men, as though it were some ferocious wild beast; it was fastened by chains to the dark cell of the cloister. But in each case it came forth from its seclusion with a power that shook the world. In the first, it convulsed the land of Israel on account of its transgressions, and was the cause of the mightiest reformation the world had ever seen. In the second, no sooner had its own chain been sundered than, as if in gratitude for its deliverance, it smote in pieces the chain of despotism that had so long bound the nation, and with a single blow sent the papal power reeling through the centuries to its final fall. I have not time to trace its trials and its triumphs. It has encountered opposition of every kind, from the vulgar taunt and sneer to the keen thrust of the dialectic. Now the coarse ribaldry of Tom Paine, the bitter virulence of Voltaire and a Rousseau, or the senseless jibes of an Ingersoll; and now the polished shafts of a Renan, the sturdy strokes of a Strauss, and the specious fallacies of a Colenso. Never did a book have to wage so incessant a warfare. Like some old citadel of the feudal times, every rampart has felt the force of the attack. Now it was its history and chronology; now its prophecy; now its miracles, and now its morality; and now its enemies are massing their forces and striking for the very heart of the fortress. On the one hand, a well-trained corps are seeking to prove its chief character a myth, or at least to disprove His divinity, and so to tear from Him that that has been the hope of the world and the glory of

His adherents. On the other, a skilled and determined band of sappers and miners are endeavoring to overthrow its foundation and to lay it level with the dust. Science has proclaimed that its days are numbered, and its teachings must be remanded to the dreams and exploded fallacies of bygone ages. There is scarcely to be given time for respectful burial. The antiquated thing must be gotten out of sight. Its light is to go out in darkness. Henceforth the heavens are to be aglow with the superior light of science. Every department of science offers its evidence in disproof of the Bible teachings. The astronomer, sweeping the heavens with his newest telescope; the geologist, probing the various strata of shale, of limestone and sandstone; the experimental scientist, with microscope in the one hand and the retort and crucible in the other, seeking to wring from its primordial atoms a refutation of the time-honored teachings of the Word of God. And these are cultured men. They come to the contest thoroughly equipped. They neither ask nor accept of quarter. They fling the black flag to the breeze, and give notice beforehand that there is to be no compromise. They are going back through the damp corridors and musty archives of the Preadamite ages, and summoning every minutest atom to testify against the Scripture teaching. They are unearthing the buried monuments of Egypt, and bidding their half-erased inscriptions prove the Bible false. They are ransacking every ancient nation of earth that they may prove by its archaeology the same dreadful truth. Professor Tyndall, in his address before the British Association in Belfast in 1874, boldly declared the opinion that a God is superfluous. He says: "There is a temptation, with Lucretius, to say that nature is seen to do all things of herself without the intermeddling of the gods. Nature, he tells us, is the Universal Mother." And then he says: "Abandoning all disguise, the confession I feel bound to make before you is, that I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that matter, which we in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence

for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium,—the promise and potency of every form and quantity of life.” And later still, as President of the Midland Institute at Birmingham, in October last, he says: “There is on all hands a growing repugnance to invoke the supernatural in accounting for the phenomena of human life; and the thoughtful minds just referred to, finding no trace of evidence in favor of any other, are driven to seek in the interaction of social forces the genesis and development of man’s moral nature.” The scientific method, he tells us, began with Democritus 460 years before the Christian era, and coming down to us through the great savans of old, has met with one great impediment, and that is the religion of the Bible. Their first great work then is to demolish this ancient superstition, this “old man of the sea,” by which they mean our reverence for and faith in the Bible. That book for which heroes have fought, martyrs bled and kings jeopardized their lives and kingdoms. Prof. Huxley, encouraged by the boldness of the President, followed the Belfast address with another blow against the immortality of the soul. Thus we are to be stripped of the dearest things of earth. Take away God and the soul’s undying being and “what have we more”? You perceive it will not do to say, as has been so often said, that the Bible, not being designed to teach science speaks in popular language, and so must be interpreted in the light of its discoveries. It is not enough that the Bible shall refrain from becoming a teacher of science. It must submit to the dictum of science even in reference to the most spiritual and essential of all truths, the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.

Now, I wish to put on record my distinct and emphatic avowal that there is no necessary conflict between religion and science. This being the work, and this the word of God, I take it that He has not given the one to contradict the other. They are two volumes from the same hand. The second given to lead the student to the knowledge of high spiritual truths that the first alone had no power to teach; and to explain many of the

mysteries in which we become involved by too exclusive a study of nature. While nature, as it is understood, is designed to throw new light upon the volume of inspiration. And thus, by the study of the two, man was to arise to that sublime knowledge of God and of himself, and that complete mastery of the earth for which he was originally created. Ever have I felt like saying to my brother scientist, "Let there be no strife between me and thee." But, if the conflict must come, if again we are to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, let us see to it that we are not unworthy sons of our noble sires. Let us prove that our reverence for the Bible is more than a sentiment, and that the Bible itself is more than a fiction. Let us prove that they possess no monopoly of zeal or argument or eloquence in their cause. I grant that the Bible was not written primarily to teach scientific truths. Yet, I claim for its teachings, broadly and distinctly, two things: 1st, They have never been contradicted by any discovery of science. And 2d, They have frequently corrected the errors of scientific men, and compelled them to accept as scientific truth the long neglected statements of the Word of God. I repeat, the scientific statements of the Bible have never in a single instance been refuted. I will confine myself to the two instances that are now exciting the most attention and eliciting the most discussion, viz., *the creation of the world* and *the creation of man*. The Bible gives us an account of the world's beginning. As there described it consisted of two separate and distinct acts. 1st, its creation, i. e., calling it from nothing; and 2d, bringing that created mass into order and beauty. The first is described in the first verse of Genesis. "In the beginning," etc. The second begins with the second verse, "And the earth was without form and void," etc. For reasons too obvious to be dwelt upon in this presence we have here nothing beyond the statement of the general fact. "It is the glory of God," says the wise man, "to conceal a thing." Man's development is by the investigation of the unknown. It is the glory of man to search out a matter. It is the province of science to fathom mysteries and to dissolve

doubts. To her discoveries we promise ever to turn an attentive and a reverent ear. But we must demand that the teaching be fact, not fiction; based upon eternal truth, and not baseless as the fabric of a vision.

Now concerning the creation there are two theories. First, between the act described in the first verse and that work, the description of which is begun in the second, there was an illimitable period. God was bringing order out of chaos. The heated crust of earth was cooling, the waters were gathered together, the mountains piled, the treasures hid away in their subterranean homes and the world prepared for the coming of man. And then, in six days of twenty-four hours each, the work was completed as described in the text. The second theory is that the days are illimitable periods of progressive preparation, and that, as Hugh Miller says, the seventh or rest day of God is the present era of redemption. Now, accept which theory you please, and what is there to contradict the scientific statements of Genesis? Do you demand illimitable eras? They are here in that unwritten period in which the Spirit of God was moving upon the face of the waters and bringing order and beauty out of the chaotic mass. Do you accept the second theory? You may lengthen the days to meet the wildest speculations of science without infringing by so much as a hair's breadth upon the teaching of Genesis. Thus far science cannot force a break with the letter of revelation.

But not content with describing the laws and forces of nature, science goes further, and seeks upon natural principles to account for its origin, or more properly speaking, to deny that it has had an origin. This is an old theory. Beginning with Democritus 400 years B. C., and coming down through Leucippus and Lucretius to Tyndall, it asserts this broad proposition: Matter is eternal, and that it has two characteristics: 1, Quantitative relations which are original; 2, Qualitative, which are secondary and derived; and thus the distinction between matter and mind is abolished. The universe has no God. There is no room for one. The theory is this: Matter is infinitely divisible.

Its essence is an invisible imponderable substance that no eye can see and no skill disclose. This essence is mind, whether human or divine. And this attenuated matter has produced all things that are. Now as this theory is put forward in the name of science, we naturally ask what are its scientific proofs? In such a discussion mere theory can have no place. But of such statements there can be no proof. It is beyond the domain of evidence. Such statements then are beyond the province of science. We know nothing of matter beyond its phenomena. No one can prove that this is not all of it. This is confessedly the only thing with which science has to do. But as there are no phenomena that can support this monstrous theory, in the name of science I pronounce it unscientific.

But take another view. This invisible, intangible, imponderable matter is the source of all life. It is possessed of power so marvellous that it has evolved by its own attritions the globes of the universe. It hung them on their axes and upholds them in their orbits. It exhibits a wisdom so inscrutable, that no mistake can be discovered in its orderings from the hour that it first threw the world in space. Its skill is perfect, whether it evolves atoms or worlds; an insect's wing or the behemoth of the seas; the lily or the oak; the animalculæ or the man. Now I submit, when men seek to overthrow the teachings of the Bible by such theories as this and call it science, it is time they had learned what science is. I pronounce it nonsense. It is a simple fact, admitted by every tyro in science, that evolution and involution must ever be equal. Before the oak can be evolved from the acorn, the oak, in potentiality, must be in the acorn. Before the lion can be evolved from the whelp, the philosopher from the babe, the lion must be in the whelp and the philosopher in the babe. And so, before the order and harmony, the grandeur and glory of the universe can be evolved from viewless matter, it must be potentially there. And so, as is admitted by Spencer, Clerk Maxwell, Du Bois Raymond, Virchow and many of the first scientists of the age, we are brought back to precisely the same dilemma with which we ori-

ginally started. The theory explains nothing. My brethren, true science is devout. It goes out beneath the spangled heavens, or walks amid the scattered beauties and perfections of earth, and with reverent voice exclaims, "Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty." "In wisdom hast Thou made them all." "Just and true are Thy ways Thou King of Saints."

Let us now examine the theories respecting the creation of man. And this will include the origin of life, of species and of mind. The Bible account of the creation of man is at once simple and impressive. It not only shows the native superiority of man to all other grades of earthly existences, but it fixes an impassable gulf between him and them. He was their lord and master. Science, as taught by Mr. Darwin, declares every living thing to be traceable to one primordial form. There he and Mr. Spencer alike stand shivering upon the frontiers of the unknowable, vainly endeavoring to evolve from this one form all the marvellous and manifold species that crowd the teeming earth. For this first form they make no attempt scientifically to account. It may be the work of God, says Darwin. "It is the product of the unknowable," says Spencer. The doctrine of evolution, considered merely as a theory of development, of "Natural Selection," as it called by Darwin, or, "The survival of the fittest," as it is termed by Spencer, contains an important and universal truth. It is manifest throughout the realm of nature, from shrubs to men. The most hardy of plants, the most active, vigorous and enterprising of birds and beasts and men survive; while others go down and out to extinction. And the world owes to these men, for their patient investigation and masterly grouping of facts, a debt of gratitude that it will not soon discharge. Were this all, did science confine itself to fact and phenomena within its domain, we would vie with their most enthusiastic admirers in preparing the immortelle for their victorious brows. But this is not all. With this as a basis, they seek to show, how, through the interminable ages of the past, all the varied forms of life, vegetable

and animal up to man have been brought forth from that primordial form. Now, admitting the truth of this hypothesis, you perceive it in no way does away with the necessity of a God. God is still necessary to account for the primordial germ, and for the potency, by which, from it, was evolved the varied species of living things and men with which the earth abounds. It is of easy demonstration that no less of wisdom and power are required to account for the existing myriads and varieties of life by evolution than by separate acts of creation. There are even those who tell us that they discover no want of harmony between this theory and the account given in Genesis. But, I am compelled to demur. With all the evidence which these tireless workers are able to adduce, I am compelled to render the Scotch verdict of "not proven." The theory that there is a tendency in the higher forms of animals to become men and in savages to attain to the highest forms of civilization is utterly baseless. The law, if it exists at all, is invariable. It is universal. It would be in force as strongly to-day, as millions of ages ago. But the history of 6,000 years has detected no solitary instance of such change, and discovered no tendency in this direction. Savage men, left to themselves, are not found to drift to civilization. The tendency is the direct opposite. Nations once cultured, that were powerful in war and advanced in science and in art, have gone down to savage life. Cities crowded with palaces and adorned with temples have stood the silent witnesses of the departed wisdom and glory of their builders. Visit the splendid ruins of Egypt, once in the forefront of civilization; of Greece, the mistress of ancient literature; of Peru and Mexico, once trodden by a cultured and powerful people, and as you read by their light the story of departed greatness, say whether this theory is supported by the facts of history. In every instance it utterly fails. The first men were not savages. Knowledge and power were the heritage of the earliest tribes of men. An eloquent but reckless lecturer has recently attempted to account for the "Dug out" of the ancient savages by the shape of the heads of

their builders. But search where you will, in tomb, or cave, or mound, and however ancient the race whose skulls you may exhume, they are still in size and shape distinctly human, many of which might have been the pride and boast of our modern philosopher. The first lesson of the family of man was that of retrogression. The first step of our race was evidently from purity to sin and from knowledge and power to ignorance and feebleness. And this holds good of every grade of life, animal and vegetable. That there are changes of outward form produced by outward circumstances is undeniable. Horses, dogs, pigeons, etc., may vary by climate and training, but they are horses, dogs and pigeons still. No training can transform the horse into a cow, or the pigeon into a canary. Culture will strip the tree of the dwarfed and knotty pear, and hang from every pendant bough the large and luscious "Bartlette," but attempt to transform that pear into a peach or the peach into a plum, and you will find at once that you have undertaken the impossible. Another fact of great importance in this discussion, but strangely overlooked by the scientists of whom we speak, is this—the development and perfection of plants and animals under domestication is through the agency of a higher power. A power not themselves, but mightier than they, reaches down and uplifts them to their loftiest pinnacle. Again: "The survival of the fittest" is the key which, it is claimed, will unlock all the mysteries of evolution, and will explain how the animalculæ becomes the man. This theory teaches that in the struggle for life the brightest, swiftest, strongest survive and the others go down and out to extinction. But this law cuts squarely across the grain of the fundamental principle of Christianity as taught by its Founder and His disciples: "Whosoever will be great among you," said Jesus, "shall be your minister: and whosoever will be the chiefest shall be servant of all." "Bear ye one another's burdens" wrote Paul to the Galatians; to the Romans, "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak;" and to the Colossians, "Forbearing one another and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against

any: even as Christ forgave you so also do ye." This sentiment pervades the Scriptures. It is the precise opposite of the boasted theory of the survival of the fittest. Will science explain how the spirit of forgiveness and the charity that "thinketh no evil, that hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things," can be evolved from the brute force that crushes and destroys all within its power?

But we pass. Evolution claims still greater achievements. It is at bottom an effort to account for the existence of all things without the intermeddling of a God. Mind is the result of the configuration of the brain. Produce a brain precisely like that of Shakespeare in his later life, and you would have one familiar with all that Shakespeare ever did, or said, or thought or wrote. To produce a Bacon, you have but to reproduce the quantum and form of Bacon's brain. Mr. Spencer says: "No idea or feeling arises save as a result of some physical force expended in producing it." Tyndall says: "Not only the more ignoble forms of an animalculæ or animal life; not only the noble forms of the horse and lion; not alone the exquisite mechanism of the human body, but that the human mind itself,—emotion, intellect, will, and all their phenomena,—were once latent in a fiery cloud." Nature he calls, as we have said, "The Universal Mother;" "The womb of all things;" that "Matter alone has in it the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." Let me put this theory clearly before you. You will find it to differ in essential particulars from those already examined. Science is heroic. It is never afraid of advancing conflicting theories. It is of its very nature to be given to changes. Of this I do not complain; but I do complain of its assaults upon the Bible, because these ephemeral assumptions are not supported by divine teaching. The theory is this: There was a time when the universe of matter was scattered through infinite space. Nebulous and infinitesimal particles sown through the illimitable fields. These minute particles, possessed of attractive and repellent poles, began to spin and whirl, and thus by their inherent centripetal and

centrifugal power the worlds were formed and driven for ages along their journeys. These whirling and spinning atoms produced life in all its various forms of beauty and grandeur. Now I submit this is too indefinite. It is based upon no experiment, founded upon no observation. Who has ever seen an atom? Who can demonstrate their existence? If matter be infinitely divisible is not the indivisible atom a contradiction in terms? But granting their existence, whence came they? What power brought them into being and sowed with them the azure fields? Whence did they derive their attractive and repellent powers? As an attempt to account for the universe, it is a miserable failure. If then it fails to account for matter, how can it account for mind? They tell us they cannot find God; but revelation long before had taught us that God is unsearchable; that no man hath seen Him at any time. They tell us they only find mind in connection with organized matter; that to injure or maim the organization is to destroy to that extent the evidence of the spirit's presence. Foolish blunderers! not to see that the body is the spirit's vehicle, its drapery of flesh, its instruments by which it works. I hold in my hand a powerful microscope. It magnifies a thousand-fold. I turn it to the infinitely small, and unseen wonders start to my view. I look through the telescope of Lord Ross, and behold! the heavens glow with worlds hitherto unseen. But, in a night, some rude hand shivers the glasses of both my instruments. I can see these wonders no longer. Am I to conclude that they no longer exist? or that the spirit that beheld them has no longer a being? What are these eyes but the spirit's glasses—these ears but the spirit's trumpets? and when you have shivered the one and closed the other, what is it that in that dark and noiseless world still feels, and thinks, and throbs, and loves, and hates and yearns? What is it that, when every avenue of the outer world is closed, still struggles to reveal itself to surrounding friends? What is it that burns undimmed amid the wreck of dissolving nature, and sings its loftiest paeans in the hour of universal gloom? My brethren,

I submit, the statements of Genesis stand unaffected by the cavils of skepticism designed to be destructive. Reason as well as revelation proclaim their truth. And when the skepticism of science shall have passed away, these two truths will be found to be eternal—God, the Creator of all things, and the Father of the human soul.

2d. *I now proceed to show that the Bible has frequently corrected the teachings of science.* The position we take is this: While the Bible is not a scientific text-book, and while it frequently and of necessity speaks on scientific subjects in popular language, as that the sun rises and sets, and so on; that wherever it teaches a fact respecting science, it makes no mistake. Scientific men boast that they correct the interpretation of the Bible. We proclaim that the Bible has corrected the teachings of scientific men. I take a few instances. Nearly 2,500 years before the Christian era, God said to Noah, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you. . . But flesh with the life thereof which is the *blood* thereof, ye shall not eat." Nine hundred years later, the same fact was reiterated by Moses to the children of Israel. And this was the basis of the prohibition of blood among the Jews from the days of the Exodus until now. Observe, this is a clear, positive statement of a scientific truth. It is either true or false. It is that the blood is possessed of a *living principle*, and that the life of the body is derived from it. Four thousand years after its first enunciation as a revealed truth, Dr. Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, and accepted and taught the Bible theory. There was not a scientific man to be found who did not impatiently reject the theory as the dream of a visionary. Nor was there a physician above forty years of age who was willing to accept it during the lifetime of Harvey. It was not until the celebrated Dr. John Hunter, by a variety of most accurate experiments proved the Bible statement to be true, that it was accepted. Who denies it now? To-day the humblest plough-boy that plods these hills has learned and accepted this Bible truth.

(2.) Take another instance: The Bible was the first book to teach the unity of all the worlds of space. It proclaims the universe to be one vast but harmonious system, made, upheld and directed by God. Listen:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, &c., (Ps. xix.) When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? &c., (Ps. viii.) He calleth the stars by name. He guideth Arcturus, Orion, Pleiades and the chambers of the South. He stretcheth out the North over the empty space and hangeth the earth upon nothing. That is science, taught with a simplicity and beauty that Copernicus and Kepler, twenty-five hundred years after, never attained. Compare this theory with those of the ancient poets and philosophers. Ovid says: "The earth hangs, a heavy weight, upon the air beneath." And Pliny, in his natural history, gravely informs us that "the suspension of the world in space is a miracle; that none can tell whether it be owing to the force of the Spirit it contains, or because there is no place to which it can fall."

(3.) Once more. Moses says in Deuteronomy, (xxxii. 2), "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew." Here is a fine and accurate discrimination between the methods by which rain and dew are given to the earth; a distinction made three thousand years before it was accepted by the scientific world. The common theory has been that the dew falls. Scarcely a century has passed since doubt was first thrown upon the subject by a German savan.

Since then repeated experiments have shown that the atmosphere contains water in solution. At night, the earth, which during the day is usually warmer than the air, rapidly loses its

heat by radiation and becomes cooler than the air; the air, coming in contact with the chilled earth, has its humidity condensed and precipitated upon surrounding objects. And thus is demonstrated the scientific accuracy of the Scripture statement. I might, was there time, mention other statements made in Scripture, as of the balancing of the clouds; the giving of snow like wool; the habits of the ant, and others, each and all of which have been disbelieved by science until by repeated experiments the truth they contained was forced upon public acceptance. Encouraged by these victories we confidently look forward to the future. We accept cheerfully the conflict of the ages. We expect that every scientific statement of the Scriptures will be thoroughly sifted and tested; and from out its fiery furnace we expect it to come forth with a beauty and power that shall force from even the lips of its enemies the concession, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

I said at the beginning that scientists have attempted to make archaeology testify against the Bible record. They have unearthed the ancient cities of Egypt, Phoenicia and Assyria; they have dragged to the light the inscriptions of ancient art and the evidences of early religion; buried monuments have been uncovered, and their time-worn hieroglyphics have been deciphered; their temples and palaces of marble, their vases of alabaster, their very bricks and paving-stones have been compelled to testify before this imperious court. They have unrolled the musty papyrus and read its ancient characters; they have threaded the long-closed chambers of the Pyramids, and snatched from those walls the long-kept mysteries. And with what result? Go search the treasures of the British Museum, and from many a chapter and pillar and plint and architrave you may read the truth of the Bible history. Go, decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and you may read on the uncovered walls of their ancient cities the

story of a nation reduced to slavery, and of men with physiognomy unmistakably Jewish, who are represented as engaged in the menial service of making bricks. The ancient papyri tell the same story, and give the name of the king in whose reign the events transpired as Rameses. We read here of the ancient faith and usages of the Egyptians, and we find them precisely such as are contained in the Pentateuch. And so of every ancient city whose history was contemporary and at all intimately allied with that of the Jews. When the records of stone are compared with the records of the Bible, they are found perfectly to harmonize. These are the stamp, and this the impression. When the impression was made, God hid away the stamp for long ages from the sight of men; and when at last the time came when men denied the truth of these records, then it was that God brought forth these tablets of stone; and when you have lifted them from the dust of ages, the stamp is shown precisely to fit into the ancient impression.

One of the obscurest of the ancient books is that of Esther. It relates a thrilling story that transpired in Shushan, in Persia. It describes a splendid palace and names a luxurious king. The pillars of his palace were of marble, its beds of silver and of gold, its hangings of green and white and blue, its cords of linen, and its pavements of marble. But is it fact or fable? Well, excavations have been made. And what have they found? Remember that Shushan in Hebrew means lily. They have found a palace of rare magnificence, with its seventy-two marble pillars, ornamented everywhere with the lily. It was the palace of lilies, and upon one of the stones of the pavement was found the name of the ancient king, Ahasuerus.

Thus, my brethren, is archaeology coming to prove the literal correctness of the Word of God. And thus will the friends of the Bible on every field signally triumph. It stands like the rock of which we are told in story. It is so evenly poised that the hand of a child might move it, while the might of a million could not hurl it from its base.

But Mr. Tyndall, following the lead of Hückel and Buchner, more than intimates that Christianity—the religion of the Bible—has been the one great opponent of the progress of science. This is certainly amazing. Such an intimation coming from most men might be allowed to pass in silence, but as an emanation of one of the most cultured men of the day, a leader withal of public thought, it deserves a passing notice.

The conditions of progress, in any department of culture,—literature, science, art,—lie not so remotely from the surface as to be classed among the unknowable or the unknown. Thinkers, as I believe, will agree with me in the statement that the progress of science depends largely upon certain conditions, political, social, intellectual and moral. I propose, therefore, to ask, what produces these conditions? What is it that makes science possible and contributes to its greatest development? I look around me and see nations rising into greatness, and ask, what made these nations great? I go to works of political economy, to Mill, Malthus, Ricardo, Adam Smith. They tell me of the need of hardihood, bravery, chivalry, love of liberty. They insist upon the need of arts and sciences, agriculture; of manufactures, of trade and commerce; of exportations that overbalance importations, and thus insuring a gradual enrichment and freedom from oppressive taxations. They then tell of the need of public and individual enterprise and industry, of justice, truth, honesty, philanthropy and love. And as I look at this array of excellences, I say, true, these make a nation great. But these are only the fruit. You have not shown the tree on which it grew. This is the stream. Where is the wondrous fountain? I go in search of this. I find the most powerful thing on earth is an idea, whether it be right or wrong. Plant an error in a body politic and it will grow and multiply and intensify until it is a magazine, needing but a single spark to blow the proud fabric to ruins. A single error planted by our forefathers in our Constitution had all but severed our noble Union, and demanded as an atonement that our land should be drenched in blood and wo, and that a heca-

tomb of our noblest sons should go down into sanguinary graves. I turn to the hoary past and see every nation of antiquity going down under a weight of error. I see wrong everywhere, and ask, is there no remedy? I turn to the Bible and ask, does it teach any ideas of political economy? I see that God planted in the world two great germ ideas. The first respects Himself; the second refers to man. It teaches that He is; that He is the Creator of all that is; that He is good, tender, merciful,—love. In a word, He is a Father, uniting the sympathies of the parent with the justice of the Judge. Of man, that he is immortal; free; accountable to God; and that all men are brethren. He has taken these two ideas and sought to plant them at the very foundation of human government; and whenever these have taken root, and precisely *as* they have gone down and up through the national life have nations flourished and prospered. Take the first thought, that of God's greatness and goodness. Estimate, if you can, the political importance of that upon any people. Remember the world-wide fact that nations grow into the likeness of the god they worship, and gauge, if you can, the power of this truth to elevate and purify a nation. The thought of the Divine purity and love, how it seizes hold of men, and lifting them out of their vileness and animosities, leads them into purity and crowns them with nobleness. Take the second—Individual responsibility and human Brotherhood—the fact that I am my brother's keeper. If he is hungry, I must feed him; if ignorant, instruct him; if weak, assist him; if sick, I must minister to him; and that I am accountable to God for the powers and privileges I possess. Let these take root in human government, and then what schools will flourish, what churches will rise; what forbearance, tenderness, sympathy, love will mark the conduct of men everywhere. I turn, then, and ask, have I not found the tree on which these fruits may grow? Is not this the fountain from which these national excellences may flow in an abundant stream? Is not this the secret of England's greatness? It is her Bible teaching, the na-

ture and the relations of God and man. What gave her Magna Charta? It was this that as a Divine leaven had made man too great for chains. What sowed the seeds of greatness in our own soil? It was the Bible brought by our Puritan fathers. These two ideas have walked the earth mightier than armies, crushing despots, subduing animosities, breathing peace. These have given loftier ideas of manhood and helped toward their attainment. They have broken to shivers the chains of the serf and the slave. They have told of possibilities inspired with heroism, infused with enterprise and crowned with gentleness and love. I say, without these ideas, which the Bible only can give, science is impossible. We have, then, this marvelous contradiction. The Bible giving the only possible basis for a correct science and yet the Bible opposing the progress of science. As well say that Michael Angelo, who gave the draft of St. Peter's and directed the workman's skill, prevented the progress of the cathedral. As well teach that the rains of spring and the suns of summer prevented the ripening of harvests. Smite down these truths and you have smitten to ruin the Jachin and Boaz of every temple of science and left its proud form to moulder in the dust. These gentlemen, while insisting upon the necessity of this fruit, mercilessly hew down the only tree on which it has ever grown. Who so blind, so biased by prejudice, so indifferent to all the facts of history and philosophy as to aver that the Bible is the foe of culture in any department? I proclaim it furnishes the highest incentives to culture and the purest standards known to earth. Of motives I will take but one. This is God's world given for human mastering. All things are to be put beneath his feet, all reins to be placed in his hands. At his command its mysteries are to pour themselves into his lap. The elements are to obey his imperious mandate. The raging tempest, the leaping billow, the chained lightning are to be his slaves. Earth and air, sea and sky, are to whisper in his ear their divinest secrets. "Subdue it, and have dominion over it," is the command of old. This alone makes science possible. These secrets are yours.

They are within your reach. They are designed as your possession. What a stimulus is this to effort! How it calls out all our powers. How it feeds our hope and leads us on through disappointment and difficulty to the goal at last. And I say, this one fact, that these hidden things are ours, is the greatest stimulant to toil. This puts certainty beneath your feet. The mechanic, certain of his principles, will toil on till his engine is complete. The physician, sure of the virtues of his drug, will persist till in the right proportions it restores the sick to health. The statesman, confident that he has discovered the truth that saves and ennobles, will stand amid all defeats with his eye flushed with the earnest of victory. So, confident that these truths are ours, man will sail all seas in their search, until, like another Columbus, he discovers a continent, and enriches a world. There is one other condition of culture. We need a model. In this age of culture and of criticism, I dare to claim for the Bible, merely as a composition, that it stands peerless among the books of time. Take its history. We have masters who have given their lives to writing the history of a people. Hume, Gibbon, Smollet, Grote, Prescott, Macaulay. But who will venture to compare those histories with that of the Bible? So simple, direct, comprehensive, unequivocal. Take biography. From Plutarch down how labored and studied their descriptions, how strained and unnatural their eulogies. Will you compare these with the life of Moses, of Joshua, Eli, Samuel, David, or the inimitable life of Jesus? How simple, natural, fresh and real are all their descriptions. The hand of the Master puts upon the canvass pictures that never fade. Their subjects live and breathe and act before us through all the centuries with life-like vividness. Or, take poetry. Immortal are the strains of Homer, Virgil, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare; but who among them will you compare with David, or Miriam, or Moses, or Isaiah? What essays can compare in perspicuity, what arguments in force, in close-ribbed, cohesive, unbroken, invulnerable logic with those of the apostle Paul?

In a word, where will you find diction so grand, imagery so

sublime, logic so conclusive, as in the word of God? Examine the writings of the masters in any age. Take, say, the splendid diction of Macaulay, or the glowing pages of a Scott, or an Irving. Scattered through these pages, like gems upon sand are quotations from the word of God. Compare, or rather contrast the two; and to the dullest intellect these quotations are, to the polished sentences among which they are found as "Apples of gold in pictures of silver." This is the pure fountain. When Plato and Lucretius and Kant and Homer and Milton have palled upon the taste, this maintains its freshness and comes to us with a "sweetness and light" that bespeak its heavenly origin. Freshness and beauty, grandeur and strength are not only found here, but they impart themselves to those who study its pages and accept for their guidance its sacred truths. And here again we meet the dilemma that while the Bible gives the greatest incentives to culture and offers the purest models it is the greatest opponent of its progress. Opposes it! No, the Bible breaks the fetters of intellect and bids it soar toward its native heaven. Without it genius is like the caged eagle, beating itself against its iron bars, trailing its wings or spreading them for an instant in the vain attempt to fly. Pacing its narrow home drooping, dejected, dwarfed. But open those doors; let it come forth in the free air and cast its eye of fire to the distant sun. For a moment it shakes itself and stretches and feels its pinions. And now it begins to rise, slowly at first, upward, upward, until with a scream of triumph it shoots like an arrow beyond the cloud, and basks in the viewless and shadowless empyrean beyond. So is the intellect under the inspiration and guidance of the word of God.

I can detain you but a moment longer. I ask you, in conclusion, to note the importance of the subjects treated of in the Bible as compared with those to which science relates. Science relates to the phenomena of matter, and to this alone. The Bible grapples with the mysteries of spirit. It tells us more of that that most interests us, of God and the soul, of present duty and future destiny, than all other books that were

ever written. What has science to teach me of God, of my relation to Him and of my duty to my fellow-man? It can penetrate the secrets of matter, but into the secrets of morals it has no power to enter. The things that most interest me, if I am a man and have a soul and am to live forever, lie in a region utterly beyond its powers. Suppose I had gone down into the very centre of the earth and had wrung from her bosom her every secret. That I had summoned the sea to unlock its mysteries and it had obeyed my mandate. The air had told me whence it cometh and whither it goeth; and the light had revealed to me its nature and properties, until the last secret of matter had been wrung from its grasp; if then I know nothing of God, of my soul, I am ignorant indeed. My friends, it is only where God is the centre of science that it can enlighten and elevate and bless. Without this it is atheistic. Science can reveal to us unseen constellations, but this shows a world beyond the constellations. Astronomy numbers and names the stars, but among them it has no place for the "Star of Bethlehem." Botany describes the plants and flowers of earth, but it knows nothing of "The Rose of Sharon," and the "Lily of the Valley." Geology tells of the various strata of our globe, but it has never discovered the "Rock of Ages." I take this atheistic science to the coffin and the grave. I point to the flowers of hope that are crushed and withered, and I ask what it has to teach me of this crushing trial? It answers, nothing. All is matter. It has gone back, dust to dust, ashes to ashes. He is as if he had never been. I go to revelation and it responds, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have entrusted unto him until that day." He has been a man of toil, of culture, of sacrifice. I ask what now to him is the profit of all his toil? And the response is, there is no reward. I turn to the Bible, and it replies, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good

fight, I have finished the course, and henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness." I ask, Is there any future happiness or woe? Are broken ties to be reunited? And of this science knows nothing. But here I read, "In my Father's house are many mansions," of the forty and four thousand, and the throng that no man can number, out of every kindred and tribe and tongue; of harp and robe and palm and crown and shout and song forever and ever. And thus it gives the crown to all virtues, and the chief ornament to all excellences. My friends, I do not discourage culture. Go, grapple with all mysteries. Go, be abreast of the age. Win laurels from all fields; but, take with you this Lamp of Eternity. This enlivens all gloom, explains many mysteries of this world and of the next; sanctifies all knowledge, qualifies for all duties, and then, when all prophecies shall fail, and tongues shall cease, and knowledge shall vanish away, then this will conduct you through the open gateway into the paradise of God, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Amen.

ART. V.—WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

BY REV. F. A. GAST, D.D.

"Jehovah created me as the beginning of his way,
Before his works of old.
From everlasting was I set up,
From the beginning, before the foundation of the earth.
When there were as yet no floods was I brought forth,
When there were no fountains abounding with water,
Before the mountains were settled,
Before the hills, was I brought forth,
Ere yet he had made the lands and the water,
And the first of the clods of the earth.
When he prepared the heavens I was there,
When he appointed a circle above the face of the deep;
When he made firm the sky above,
When the fountains of the deep waxed strong;
When he gave to the sea its bounds,
That the waters should not pass its border;
When he appointed the foundations of the earth;
Then was I at his side as a master builder,
And was delighted day by day,
Rejoicing before him continually,
Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth,
And my delight was with the sons of men." Prov. 8:22-31.

THE portraiture of Wisdom given in these words is as surprising as it is sublime. It is, perhaps, the nearest approach ever made in an independent way by the ancient Hebrew mind, to what among Aryan nations is called speculative philosophy. Some have questioned whether it can be rightly said that the people of Israel had a philosophy at all in any proper sense. And, if by philosophy we are to understand theoretical inquiries of science, ruled by strict logic, pursued by a speculative method, and reduced to a systematic whole, we are constrained to answer the question in the negative.

But this conception, it will generally be admitted, is altogether too narrow. Etymologically, philosophy is simply the

love of wisdom. In this it begins, and this is its deepest life: wherever the human mind earnestly struggles to reach a satisfactory solution of the great problem of existence with which it is everywhere confronted, there we have philosophy.

In this wider sense, we may justly claim a place for it among the chosen people of God. What else have we in the Book of Proverbs, in the Book of Ecclesiastes, and especially in the Book of Job? What are they, if not lofty endeavors to ascertain the right relation between God and the world, and in the light of this relation to set forth the highest ends of human life? True, this philosophy is not the product simply of the unaided reason; it rests upon, and remains continually rooted in, divine revelation. "The method of Greece," says Westcott, "was to proceed from life to God; the method of Israel (so to speak) was to proceed from God to life. The axioms of one system are the conclusions of the other."*

The character of Hebrew philosophy is not so much scientific and systematic, as it is religious and poetic. Its aim is more practical than theoretical. Yet for all this, it is none the less philosophy. It is not, indeed, of a metaphysical and speculative cast. It does not engage in inquiries concerning abstract, absolute being. For inquiries of this sort the Semitic mind had little capacity and less inclination. In the East the pursuit of wisdom has always been in the interest of the practical realities of life; and this is particularly true of the people of Israel, whose divine philosophy was built up by fact, rather than by speculation.

We are the more surprised then, when we meet with an idea like that of Wisdom in this passage of Proverbs. Wisdom is here presented in a form quite unexpected. It seems at first to wear anything rather than an Old Testament aspect, and reminds us of the profound thought of Plato or the profounder thought of John. And when we remember the powerful influence this portion of Scripture has exerted, not only on the later Jewish mind as it found expression in the Apocrypha and

* Art. Philosophy, Smith's Dict. of the Bible.

the writings of Philo, but also on the New Testament representations of revealed truth,—when we remember the important role it played in the Trinitarian controversies, and how its very rendering from the original into other languages varied with the dogmatic conception of the translators—it becomes evident at once that the subject is worthy of careful consideration.

What are we to understand by Wisdom as here portrayed? It is manifestly not the rhetorical personification of a divine attribute, represented "as a female and a queen, dispensing her rewards to those who gain her acquaintance, and the assistant of the Almighty in the creation of the world." Noyes finds it difficult to conceive that any one who attends to what is said of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs should fail to perceive that this is the true view. And Adam Clarke remarks on this verse:—"Here Wisdom is again personified; but the prosopopœia is carried on to a greater length than before, and with much more variety. It is represented in this chapter in a twofold point of view: 1. Wisdom, the power of judging rightly, implying the knowledge of divine and human things. 2. As an attribute of God, particularly displayed in the various and astonishing works of creation. Nor has it any other meaning in this whole chapter, whatever some of the Fathers may have dreamed, who find allegorical meanings everywhere."

As an attribute of God, Wisdom does, indeed, come to view in the book of Proverbs, especially in chap. 3:19, 20; "Jehovah hath with wisdom founded the earth, the heavens hath he established by understanding; by his knowledge were the floods divided." Here the parallelism in which wisdom corresponds to understanding and knowledge, shows that wisdom must be regarded as a quality of the divine mind, and not as something objective to God.

It is very different, however, in chap. viii. Here Wisdom is personified and represented throughout as preaching. We may be told, indeed, that the Oriental imagination is bold, and that its imagery is often extravagant; yet a careful consideration shows that what is said of Wisdom in this passage cannot be

resolved into an empty figure of speech. Wisdom is not simply a property or quality of the mind of God invested by the free poetic fancy with personal attributes. Figurative language we certainly have; but it is not all a figure. That would hardly be in accord with the solemn tone of the address. "For a correct understanding of the section before us," says Zöckler, "two things in general are to be observed: (1) That the entire discourse is poetical, and that therefore the personification of Wisdom which forms its chief subject is also to be regarded as essentially and in the first instance the product of a bold sweep of thought, and of a vivid Oriental imagery; (2) That, however, because of the solemn earnestness and profoundly religious character of the discourse, its figurative element cannot possibly be viewed as the mere play of fancy, or an empty ringing of phrases, but must everywhere stand in more or less exact harmony with the supersensuous thought that is to be set forth. Wisdom, which here appears personified as the principle of the world's creation as well as of its preservation and government, having sprung from God Himself and being absolutely supernatural, is no unsubstantial phantom, no unreal fiction of the fancy, no poetic creation without any underlying higher reality."

It is only necessary to read this chapter with some degree of care to see that Wisdom, as it here addresses us, can not be identical with wisdom, as an attribute of God. This is plain already in the first half, where Wisdom represents herself as the principle ruling in divine providence, and manifesting herself especially in the moral and religious sphere. The entire tone of the discourse and the natural force of the various expressions employed, point to something more than a poetic personification of a divine attribute, and are absolutely inconsistent with any interpretation that does not recognize in the speaker a real power working in the life of man. "I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence, and find out the knowledge of sagacious counsels. Counsel is mine and sound wisdom: I am understanding; I have strength." How meaningless the language, if

referred to the divine attribute of wisdom ! How absurd to suppose that the attribute of wisdom represents itself here as clothed with counsel, reason, understanding, and strength ! "I Wisdom, am understanding." "The wisdom of God by prosopopœia becomes a speaker ; and then, by metaphor, is transformed back again to an attribute ; but in the process loses its identity, and is now the divine understanding !" Certainly, a surprising and perplexing mixture of figures of speech !

It is almost inconceivable how any one, who reads this chapter with attention, can fail to see that the predicates ascribed to Wisdom are those of real existence, Counsel, understanding, strength : these are qualities affirmed in *Isaiah xi. 2*, of the Messiah, as here of Wisdom. "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth. I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me. Riches and honor are with me ; durable riches and righteousness. My fruit is better than gold, yea, than fine gold, and my revenue than choice silver. I walk in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of justice, that I may cause those that love me to possess substance ; yea, I fill their treasures." This certainly is not the description of an abstract attribute personified, but of a power which, whatever may be its nature, has true substantial being.

That Wisdom is a power external to God having all the attributes of reality and standing before him continually as an object of his contemplation, becomes still clearer when we consider vv. 22-31, where she describes her origin and premundane existence with God. "Jehovah created me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old." Wisdom, then, is a divine creation, the beginning of God's manifestation of Himself in the world. With what propriety could this be said of an attribute of God ? She distinguishes herself carefully, on the one hand, from Jehovah who brought her into existence, and on the other, from all His works, whether in heaven or on earth. Her's is a unique being, premundane and yet the offspring of God. "From everlasting was I set up, from the beginning,

before the foundation of the earth." She is intermediate between the Creator and His creation,—"the beginning of his way." "When he prepared the heavens, I was there, when he appointed a circle above the face of the deep; when he made firm the sky above, when the fountains of the deep waxed strong; when he gave to the sea its bounds, that the waters should not pass its border; when he appointed the foundations of the earth; then was I at his side." This is language that involuntarily reminds us of the introduction to John's Gospel.

Wisdom, however, is more than the witness simply of the creation. "I was at his side as a master builder." She was, as it were, co-creative with God, delighting herself day by day with each new advance in the movement of creation, rejoicing before Him continually as a spirited child, rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth, and her delight was with the sons of men, looking forward thus from the first to what should be the crown of creation.

But if Wisdom has objective reality, are we warranted in affirming that she is a self-conscious, intelligent existence, a real personality? Not, we think, unless we are at liberty to regard her as an hypostasis in the Godhead. She distinguishes too broadly between her unique being and that of all created existences in the whole universe to allow us to suppose that she is, for example, an angel endowed with the highest power and knowledge,—the first-born of creatures, created immediately by God to serve as His agent in bringing the creation of heaven and earth to pass. This was the idea the Arians entertained of Wisdom. Arius himself says: "Having determined to create us, God created a certain being whom He named Logos, Wisdom, and Son, in order to create us by him." "By all this," says Neander, "he intended by no means to lower the dignity of Christ; but would ascribe to him the greatest dignity which a being could have after God, without entirely annulling the distinction between that being and God. God created him, or begat him, with the intent through him to produce all things else; the distance betwixt God and all other

beings is too great to allow of the supposition that God could have produced them immediately. In the first place, therefore, when He determined to produce the entire creation He begat a being who is as like to Him in perfections as any creature can be for the purpose of producing, by the instrumentality of this being, the whole creation. The names, Son of God and Logos, were given to Him in order to distinguish Him from other created beings, inasmuch as, although, like all created beings, He owed everything to the will and favor of the Creator, he yet enjoyed the nearest relationship to Him, inasmuch as the divine reason, wisdom, power, all which titles could be transferred to Christ in an improper metonymical sense, were yet manifested by Him in the most perfect degree."*

This idea has no support in the book of Proverbs. Wisdom is not of one order with the empirical life of the world. Her being is of a premundane and transcendental character. But of this she would be divested, if she were a created personality, however lofty in the scale of existence. She would simply be the first in the order of time in the series of creaturely existences.

But may we not look upon Wisdom as a divine personality? The early church fathers and many interpreters since have found in her the Logos of St. John. Wisdom and the Logos are, indeed, closely related. The latter is a higher doctrinal development, under the guidance of divine revelation, of what lay involved in the former. Wisdom is the Old Testament basis of the New Testament Logos.

The two, however, are by no means identical. If anything is clear it is that the Logos is uncreated. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made."

On the other hand, Wisdom is a creation of God. She ex-

* Neander's Church History, vol. ii. p. 362.

pressly says: "Jehovah created me in the beginning of his way." Unfortunately, our authorized version, following the Vulgate, has: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way." The word here rendered *possessed* is קְנָה, which signifies primarily *to set up, to erect*, as is evident from a comparison with the kindred roots קָנָה, קָנָה and such derivations as קְנָה and קָנָה. In actual use, קְנָה signifies 1, *to found, to create*; 2, *to acquire, to get*, that is, to attain to the possession of a thing either by creation or purchase; and 3, *to own, to possess*. The sense *to possess* is unfolded from the more radical sense *to get or acquire*. The verb taken by itself never means *to possess* simply and solely. It always indicates the act of coming into possession. Now of the signification of this word, the signification *to possess* must be excluded from this passage. In this the lexicons of Gesenius, Fuerst, and Lee are in agreement. And it must not be overlooked that possession by acquirement is, on the part of God, equivalent to production or creation. The word must here bear the meaning *to create*. This alone suits the connection. Wisdom says: "When there were as yet no floods was I brought forth, "Before the hills was I brought forth" (vv. 24 and 25); and again, "From everlasting was I set up." This birth and setting up are more in harmony with the idea of creation than with that of possession.

Moreover, the oldest versions understood קְנָה as signifying *to create*. The Septuagint renders it by ἔκτισεν. The Targums and the Peshito have the Aramaic form of the Hebrew קְנָה, *to create*, though both in the Chaldee and Syriac the verb corresponding to the Hebrew קְנָה is found, and in the sense *to possess*. So, too, the writer of Ecclesiasticus, in passages founded on this of Proverbs, employs the word ἔκτισεν. "Wisdom hath been created (ἔκτισται) before all things," (i. 4). "He created her," (ἔκτισεν αὐτήν) (i. 9). "He created me (ἔκτισέν με) from the beginning before the world" (xxiv. 9.) In fact this was the understanding of Prov. vii. 22, till the time of

the Trinitarian controversies, when, to deprive the Arians of a text which they eagerly seized upon to prove that the Logos is the first-born of creatures, the orthodox changed the current translation.

The writer of Proverbs evidently had not in mind the eternal, personal Logos of John, a second hypostasis in the Godhead. His language would be unsuitable to convey this thought. A feminine noun (חָכְמָה) would not be employed to set forth a divine personality. We may be sure the passage has no direct relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. At all events it was not apprehended in this way by the later Jews. We have only to read the Apocryphal books of Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon, which are a further development of the doctrine of Wisdom contained in the book of Proverbs, to see that Wisdom here is not a divine hypostasis, in the sense of the Church doctrine of the Trinity, any more than in the Logos of Philo.

And yet Wisdom is not an ordinary creature, whether personal or impersonal, belonging to the world of sense. We have said that she is objective to God and has real existence; but her reality is not of an empirical kind. She is real in the sense of being truly substantive, and not merely notional. Though entering into creation and constituting its inmost meaning, she yet transcends the entire order of things as it has come to pass by creation, and belongs to a premundane sphere. She is not the first-born of an endless series of existences, but a power lying back of them and presupposed by them.

This is clear from our passage. Wisdom says she was before Jehovah's works of old, and therefore not one of them. She was by His side when He prepared the heavens and the earth and all things they contain. From everlasting she was set up, created especially—not as our English version, wrongly supplying the preposition, renders "*in the beginning of his way*," but—"as the beginning of his way," the first-fruits of His goings forth from the depths of His absolute being, the primal manifestation of Himself *ad extra*, and the ground of all further

manifestations in nature and in history. She is so absolutely presupposed by creation that she is the directress of the entire work. For this is unquestionably the meaning of the word **נָבוֹת**, which our authorized version renders *as one brought up with Him*, as a foster child. Derived from a root **נָבַת**, *to be firm, stable*, it signifies *an architect, builder, opifex*. So it is understood by most Hebrew scholars to-day, and so it was understood by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, who in a description of Wisdom, based on this passage, says: "Wisdom which is the worker (*τεχνίτης*) of all things," (vii. 21). This was also the understanding of the Greek translators, who render: "I was with Him adapting" (*ἀρμόζοντα*), and of Jerome, who gives *cuncta componens*.

The office of Wisdom, then, is that of mediator in some sense between the absolute God and the finite creation. "Then was I at his side as master builder; was delighted day by day, rejoicing before him continually, rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delight did I find in the sons of men." Wisdom was present at creation, as an active agent, finding satisfaction in its movement, but not finding her highest satisfaction, till that movement reached its culmination in man. We have here the counterpart of the constantly repeated word of God: "and it was good," and of the final word at the completion of creation: "Behold it was very good."

What, then, is wisdom? Let us gather up her attributes as they have come to view in our discussion thus far.

Wisdom is distinct from God, an object of His contemplation; and yet eternally with God, a source of divine delight.

She is the child of God; He created her, brought her forth, set her up; and yet her birth is not in time but from everlasting.

She is before the world; and yet she is in order to it, the first-fruits of God's self-manifestation, and the unconditional presupposition of the world in time and space.

She is above the world; and yet she enters into it as the plastic idea that moulds all individual forms and combines

them into the cosmos, both in its extension in space and in its development in time.

Now these attributes meet fully and harmoniously only in one object of thought. That, we have seen, cannot be an eternal, divine personality, nor yet an ordinary created personality. It must be a personification, but a personification of something that possesses substantial reality. And what is that if not *the divine ideal world, the world of eternal types* of which the empirical world is only the realization in time and space? "For let it be said at once, not only Philosophy and falsely celebrated Gnosis, but Scripture also, knows and speaks of a divine ideal-world, to which the time-world is related as the historical realization of an eternal design. That all which is realized in temporal history has existed from everlasting in God's sight as a spiritual pattern, and then as an idea in God, is not only taught in Plato, but also in kindred testimonies of sacred history, of which Plato knew nothing: Isaiah, for instance, (xxii. 11; xxv. 1; xxxvii. 26 and throughout in chaps. xl.-xlvi.); and the New Testament Scriptures which reveal the mystery in a way that was unattainable to the Old Testament. There are even two New Testament statements which in form recall the speculative Hellenic mode of expression. For when Paul (in Rom. iv. 17) describes God as *καλῶν τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα*, this is literally Philo's formula of God the creator, *τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἐσδίλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι*; and although Paul, and Scripture in general are as far removed as heaven itself from teaching an eternal *Ὧλη*, a *μὴ ὄν* in the Platonic sense, yet still Paul, no less intentionally than Philo, says (when he expresses himself punctiliously) *μὴ ὄντα*, and not *οὐκ ὄντα* on the ground that that which comes forward into historical existence is not previously an absolute nothing. Abraham as a father of the nations was an everlasting subject of divine knowledge, and as such is *μὴ ὄν*, so long as he was waiting in readiness to come into existence forthwith, when the creative *καλεῖν* is uttered. The other passage is Heb. xi. 3, where it is said that the world system in all its parts, *οἱ αἰῶνες*, was created by God's word,

εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐξ φανομένων τὸ βλεπόμενων γεγονέναι. Here also the writer purposely avoided saying *οὐκ* ἐξ ὄντων, as 2 Macc. vii. 28 (although this expression might have been justified, as in the sense of *creatio ex nihilo*, by way of excluding the idea of the eternity of matter), but *μὴ ἐξ φανομένων*. All that was created by God's word was, prior to that creation, a *μὴ φανομένον*; that is, something which is not yet brought forward into manifestation, into temporal historical actuality. It existed only as a divine idea. Even when *μὴ* is associated with *γεγονέναι*, the meaning is the same, for the contrast implied in addition is *ἄλλ' ἐξ νοητῶν*; and these *νοητά* are the very eternal invisible exemplars, whence proceeded, as from their ideal source, by the divine fiat, the visible reality. And faith is precisely that which pierces through the phenomenal externality of the world to this its supersensuous essence, and to its production therefrom by means of the purely spiritual power of the divine creative word. Or could the author actually only mean to say, that no sensible material was at the source of the visible world? The mode of expressing an assertion in itself undoubtedly true would be strangely chosen. The words themselves say, either that the visible did not proceed from that which was material (but spiritual), or else that it proceeded from the supersensual (spiritual). But what would be the contrary of this natural, or what would this supernatural be, other than the thoughts of that world one day to come into existence, thoughts formed and established by decree from eternity,—*scil. the divine ideas?"**

God in His wisdom thinks the world as a whole and in all its parts. But God's thinking is creative and brings to pass what He thinks. His thought is not a mere notion in His mind; it assumes substantial form. Only the form is first not that of the empirical world, but that of the world of ideas, which transcends the material and the visible, the temporal and the spatial, and yet is truly substantial and not merely notional.

* Delitzsch's Bib. Psychology, p. 46.

This sum of all God's thoughts of the world,—this objective reflection of the divine subjective wisdom,—is Wisdom personified. "That here," to quote again from Delitzsch, "Wisdom is not meant only as an attribute, but that an everlasting¹ essentially divine fact is announced, the ancients probably perceived: their mistake was only in taking generally the birth of the Logos to be this fact. It is not the person of the Logos which here proclaims its origin from God, but the Wisdom which is impersonal, and nevertheless existing still for itself, which is the eternal reflection of the world plan of the Godhead; *ξσοπτρον ἀχριδωτον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνεργίας*, as the book of Wisdom beautifully and pertinently says: for the Greek Apocryphal writers and generally the Alexandrian school, have prosecuted this knowledge offered to them by the Scripture more deeply, and yet not even they without confusing *σοφία* and *λόγος*; for it was not till the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus Christ that this mystery was cleared up, and the error of such avoided."*

This interpretation, and this alone, seems to meet the requirements of our passage. Let us look for a moment at the chief points:

1. Wisdom, as the ideal world, is a creation of God, a product of His thought. We may say, it is His thought made objective to Himself, His thought in its primal external form. Wisdom is not then self-existent, like God, but dependent like the creature.

2. Wisdom, as the ideal world, possesses objectivity even for God. It is His thought, or rather the complex of His thoughts, of the world. It is not, however, an empty abstraction of His mind. We may compare it to a mirror, which reflects in a most real way, the world plan as it dwells in the divine mind. Wisdom is, therefore, described as distinct from God and as having substantial reality.

3. Yet, though objective to God and the creation of His thought, Wisdom, as the ideal world, is in eternity. For it is

* Delitzsch's Bib. Psychology, p. 53.

the scheme of the world, outlining all that the world contains, outlining time as one of the forms of cosmical existence and consequently before time. To the old question, what God did before He made the world, we may reply, that for Him the world, in its ideal form, always was, and that He contemplated it eternally in the ideal substantiality.

5. Wisdom, as the ideal world, constitutes the inmost truth and life of the time and space world. It exists before time and transcends space, but does not remain isolated. Rather, coming out of the bosom of eternity and infinity, it enters into the conditions of natural and historical existence. The world, both natural and spiritual, is only the external drapery with which the eternal ideal, yet substantial types have clothed themselves. The ideal world is not a realm of shadows. It is the most real of all existences, except God. It is the inmost soul of all things; and only as they actualize its substantive ideas do they reach their highest meaning.

6. Wisdom, as the ideal world, is active in creation and providence. She is the artifex, directing the entire movement. The movement of the world is a process in which the eternal divine ideas, entering into time and space, clothe themselves with the forms of empirical existence. They work in a plastic way; and hence Wisdom is rightly described as the *לְאַשְׁר*, *principium*, the principle of creation and history.

Finally, Wisdom, as the ideal world, works teleologically. There is a goal towards which the movement looks from the start; and as the ideas realize themselves progressively in time and space, Wisdom rejoices day by day, though not till man enters upon the scene, does she rejoice with the highest joy. Her delights are with the sons of men.

ART. VI.—LIFE IN THE WORLDS THAT WE LIVE IN.

BY HON. R. E. WRIGHT, ALLENTOWN, PA.

I AM here this evening in answer to an invitation which I received some time ago from the members of the Diagnothian Society, to deliver what is known as "the biennial address," before the literary societies represented in Franklin and Marshall College.

With thanks for the honor implied conferred in that invitation, I accepted it, because I had reason to believe that it was expected, and probably desired, by those under whose auspices this audience has assembled, rather than because of any very ardent wish on my part to occupy a position so prominent.

With the views that I have long entertained in regard to the responsibility which rests on all who assume to teach their fellow-men in public, I have come at length to avoid rather than court the performance of such duty; and I enter upon it here and now more deeply impressed with the fear of saying something that may be misunderstood or misapplied than inspired with the hope of adding anything to the stores of wisdom that may be gathered here without me.

Spoken thoughts are sometimes things that never die; and although the words may and will be lost forever in immensity, the thought which they convey may be felt, for good or evil, throughout the countless ages of eternity. Still, when we, who have attained or passed the meridian of life, look back, on the eager, enthusiastic, youthful crowd that is pressing after us in life's career, rushing, it may be, with heedless feet along the dangerous paths which we passed over years ago, and who will soon fill our places and stand on the ground that we now

occupy, it seems natural and proper to act as though it were an imperative, sacred duty to utter in their hearing some encouraging or warning words, and lend them an experienced and friendly hand to aid them in their onward and upward course. Nor do I see how any one can question the propriety of this benevolent and paternal feeling. For although it is manifest that there is much to be learned by all, that years alone can teach; so very much to be seen, and felt, and suffered and enjoyed, that every one of us must see, and feel, and suffer and enjoy for himself, before it can be truly known, it is nevertheless a very proper thing, at proper times, for any who have passed the more dangerous rocks and shoals that lie in the way of our "voyage of life," to indicate to those who have not yet seen them their existence and position, and show them the way in which they may be avoided; and as it is also a very wise and prudent thing in those who have not yet reached these threatening points, to listen to such well-meant admonitions, and from the failure or success of those who have gone before, attain in advance the knowledge that may enable them to avoid these dangers and stem successfully the many adverse currents that *will* cross their course upon the stream of time; and dash, with more or less of violence, against the ship with which their present and eternal hopes are freighted. But, while all this is true, and while, in the well-ordered family, the school and the Church, it seems to be accepted by all as an imperative rule of action, I am not very sure that, beyond these well-worked fields, it is of much practical utility.

It is so much easier to enunciate a truth than it is to accept and act upon it; so much easier to define a plan for future action, than it is to pursue it, that much of the wisest teaching of our wisest men is practically thrown away. If this were not so, then we who live in this land, and especially in these times, would be among the wisest peoples on the earth. For, in this free and easy, restless age of ours, thousands of well-filled pulpits, and scientific lecture desks, and thousands upon thousands of periodical publications pour forth incessant streams of more

or less diluted wisdom ; while from Congress halls and legislative assemblies, the Solons of our states and nation are ever scattering, far and wide, their floods of eloquence and statesmanship ; and yet, with all this, it does not seem to me that the end ostensibly in view has fully justified the means that are used to attain it, or, that, in morals, science, or true practical statesmanship, we are very far in advance of our civilized neighbors. We might be morally worse and somewhat more ignorant without all this, but the millenium still seems very far away, and I am very sure that the "age of honest politics," so long lamented, has not returned, if it ever did exist on earth. Still with all these failures, the work in this direction will never end. Our "*old men will see visions,*" and with the very best intentions will ever be willing to expound them ; but, "*our young men will dream dreams*" of a brighter hue, which, to them, will be true enough and real enough to occupy their waking hours, and close their ears to the harsher lessons which maturer age would force upon them. I do not know that we should complain of this, for it is most natural and is probably so ordered for the wisest reasons. If it were not so, many a young life would be permanently darkened, that is now bright and buoyant and hopeful, in the innocence of unconscious ignorance. If the young were wise and prudent as the old ; if the clear, bright sunshine of life's early spring were shadowed by the clouds that are sure to come with winter ; if the doubt and distrust that we are all compelled by time and sad experience to entertain, of manhood's truth, and woman's plighted faith, and love's sincerity, and friendship's zeal,—were mingled with the earlier aspirations of youth, it would mar the purest happiness, and dim the brightest pleasure that is known on earth. Still this *teaching* duty will remain a duty as long as there are old and young upon the earth, and the only care that they who attempt it need have, is to counsel well and wisely when they do so.

Words fitly spoken are said to be like "apples of gold in pictures of silver,"—a thought which seems to indicate, even in

that olden time, the comparative value of these metals, a difference which time has left unaltered. "Silvery speech" is now and has ever been a very current coin, and need not be remonetized; but, no addition to its weight will ever bring it up to par with "golden silence."

In view of these considerations, what should be our theme to-night? What "words fitly spoken" shall I utter in your hearing here and now? How shall I best do honor to the institution that is represented here, to the occasion which has brought us together, and to those by whose invitation I am with you now. I would that I could answer all these questions well and wisely. Thanking you, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the literary societies of Franklin and Marshall College, for your attendance here, allow me, in my own name, to ask your patient attention while I venture to present in your hearing a few crude thoughts on

LIFE IN THE WORLDS THAT WE LIVE IN.

ALTHOUGH all will concede that man is the highest of all created earthly beings, that he is pre-eminently endowed with the desire and the power to know and understand as much of the origin and object of that which is within and around him, as any finite being should desire, or ought to know and understand while here, it is just as true and undeniable that his powers are and ever have been far below his wishes, that by some external, imperative agency he is constantly reminded of his finite nature, of the fact that there is a limit to his investigations, and that after all that has been accomplished, the wisest of our race are they whose mightiest mental efforts culminate in the most certain convictions, and the fullest and frankest admission, that with all our glorious gifts we certainly were made, and while here will remain somewhat "lower than the angels."

Mysteries, profound, unfathomable mysteries fill our material mental and moral worlds. As we pass along the path that lies between our cradles and our coffins, they rise up everywhere

around us. As we grow in physical and mental strength they crowd in upon us on every side; increase in number as our days increase, challenge at every turn our closest observation, and baffle our profoundest investigation, until tired of demonstrations that never demonstrate, and of solutions that never solve to our satisfaction, we at length abandon the struggle, some to enjoy as best they can their life on earth regardless of its origin or object, others to close their mental eyes, as almost useless here, hoping and waiting, it may be, for another world and a longer life in which purer thoughts and clearer light may meet and aid them in their heart-loved work.

Among all these mysteries there is none more common, more prominent, more absorbing, or more incomprehensible than that of life! Life here or hereafter. Life physical or spiritual. Life as we see it everywhere around us in myriad forms of animal and vegetable existences: ever varying, constantly departing and renewing, but never disappearing from any portion of the material universe; and life, as it will be when we lay our finite portion of it down on earth, to resume or continue it in some other world in full perfection forever.

Who on earth can solve this mystery? Shall we ever know while here anything more with certainty than the fact of our existence for an uncertain time, as one of the countless multitudes of earthly beings? Is it to be the fate of our race hereafter, as heretofore, to live with our fellows, to love and hate, to grow old and die, to use and abuse at will the products of the planet on which we have been placed, to wonder at its mysteries, struggle with its elements, enjoy its benefits while on it; and then pass away from all these things without having ever had one certain definite thought as to the nature of that which we received at birth, which unlike the animal and vegetable we have power to use or abuse, preserve or destroy, at any time during the few or many years that we are permitted to retain it, but which like them we must one day abandon in obedience to a law that came upon earth with the advent of our race, and which will govern us and all cre-

ated things, "until the last syllable of recorded time." It is not for us to question the will or wisdom of the Most High, but, I think, we may rest in the belief that such knowledge is too high for us while here. That, much as we are able to acquire, much as we are permitted to know, this one thing is hidden from us.

That our brightest vision of it while on earth, even when aided by the strongest faith and the clearest revelation ever given to man, will be and remain "as through a glass darkly." That it is our fate to know, that we must continue to move, while here, with uncertain steps, where we would fain tread with firm, unfaltering feet, and feel that the sweetest music we can summon from the harmonies of creation must ever reach our ears in a minor, wailing key of disappointment.

Recipients of life we know are everywhere around us. So sure are we of this, that we cannot even think of a place in all the universe where they are not. Recipients of life were ever in existence. So sure are we of this, that we cannot ever imagine a time they were not.

When this earth was "*without form and void*" it had been created and existed as a recipient of the life that was to permeate it when the Spirit of God "*should move upon the face of the waters*;" nor can we without most narrow and contracted views of God as a creator, and His well-known attributes of Infinite Love and Wisdom, imagine a time when, or a place where, this eternal flood of life and its endless list of appropriate recipients, will cease to be.

All these recipients of life have their births and deaths.

In the grave in which they all in turn decay, new life begins again, in all the freshness of unsullied youth, and from the smallest insect to the mightiest monster of the earth, their progeny return to live and grow and flourish, as beautiful and as free from care, as though their ancestors were not mouldering in the earth beneath them.

In view of all these facts of life and death, there must, it seems to me, arise in every thinking mind, the thought and the

belief, that the unseen, omnipresent power that animates all living things must be something that was never made, and that can never die; that therefore it must be God Himself, who, as a Creator, is ever forming recipients adapted to receive Him in infinitely modified degrees and forms. Who breathed into the parent of our race that which made him a "living soul" and who condescends to fill with life, the tiniest insect that sits and sings away its sweet ephemeral life on the smallest leaflet of the lowliest plant that grows upon the humblest planet in the universe.

I have no wish to waste your time in discussing, with show of learning, all or any of the theories which scientists, ancient or modern, have formed on this abstruse subject.

But, resting on the Christian faith, that life, whether physical or spiritual, is an attribute of God, a never-ceasing emanation from Him, as heat and light are ever flowing from the sun,—an influence or power that like the apocalyptic river of life, it flows forever from His throne, ever seeking and finding everywhere appropriate recipients created to receive it I prefer to pause just here as to this portion of our theme, and turn the current of our thoughts to that which we can know of the life that is in us, and the use that we should make of it in the worlds that we live in, in the hope that something may be learned of ourselves as God has made us; something of our true position in the worlds in which we have been placed; our personal, practical relation to these worlds and to the laws by which we and they are governed.

The time devoted to thoughts like these will not be lost, if, in this money-loving, pleasure-seeking, office-hunting age of ours, we may be induced to pause in our restless career, and feel and know that there is something higher than these earthly treasures; that the words "life" and "death" are something more than merely pleasant or unpleasant sounds; and ascertain the true value of the one, and the everlasting consequences of the other; the nature of our physical and spiritual existence, and the laws by which they are governed.

It is on this kind of knowledge that all true worldly wisdom and all rational religion depend, for, until we know ourselves, the nature of the worlds that we live in, and the laws by which we and they are governed, we cannot win the good which follows their observance, nor avoid the consequences of neglect or disobedience. I have spoken of these worlds, in the plural number, for there are more than one, in which we must spend our lives. Two of them are the work of our Father in the heavens, the others are the work of man, the outbirths of our social lives on earth. All of these worlds are governed by appropriate laws, which in efficiency and wisdom represent exactly the authors of their being.

First in order then, if not in importance, let us consider the material world, with its laws, rewards and punishments. Into it we are brought at birth, and on it we remain until we reach the point called "death," a beginning and an ending, which many of our scientists think they understand, but, which, in all the ages that have passed away since man first walked in Eden, have not responded, and in all human probability never will respond, to all the wisdom and research which science can bring to bear upon them. Disheartening as this thought may seem, there is nothing wrong in attempting at least, to know all that can be known about them. Indeed there is no alternative. We must move in that direction, or suffer for it. For it is only so far as we comprehend the phenomena which the material world is constantly presenting to our senses, the conditions under which they are presented, and the laws by which they are controlled, that we can be really wise concerning them, and only so far as we adapt ourselves to these conditions that we can be physically happy. For one portion of our two-fold nature, this planet is our only home. Into it we are brought without our knowledge or consent. On it we are permitted to exercise and enlarge, improve, or neglect and destroy our physical, mental and moral powers. Here we must enact the parts that are allotted to us, or which have been chosen by ourselves; must live and labor in them, and fail or triumph,

suffer or enjoy, just as we know and obey the laws by which it is governed.

These laws are everywhere around us, ever compelling us to note their order and beauty, and the utility of their results.

Pause for a moment, and note how this home of ours, with its immense size and weight, swims, so to speak, in boundless space, moving in its ancient orbit, with all its grand and beautiful and awful incidents, as true and certain now, as on creation's morn. Its lovely combination of land and sea, its ever-flowing streams, never the same, and yet alike forever. Its mighty oceans ever receiving the waters of these exhaustless streams, yet never over-full, and the accurate, unceasing laws of evaporation and condensation, that carries rain to all the arid earth, and fills again the numberless rills and rivers, which flow forever back to their ocean home. Its constant tides that ebb and flow in every sea, obedient to the law that gave the moon her place among the stars of Heaven. Its day and night, its summer and winter, its seed time and harvest that never fail. The lofty hills and lovely vales which adorn and beautify its surface, and its internal structure which tells to the scientist to-day the story of its age and origin, and furnishes to man so much of that, without which life and progress on the earth would be almost a failure.

The vast variety of animal and vegetable existences, and the simple, infallible provision for their being, preservation and succession. The wonderful atmosphere which surrounds it, in which we live and move from birth to death, without one single anxious thought, as to its vast height and ponderous weight; which is now a zephyr, and anon a tempest, now winning soft music from aeolian harp-strings, or whispering through delicate flower beds, redolent with stolen fragrance, and anon rioting at will among dark untrodden forests, swaying their gnarled and sturdy limbs, as easily as it bent the most delicate blade of grass;" that stoops to "fan the sick man's fevered brow," or "dry the moistened curls that rest upon the sleeping infant's forehead; and anon, in answer to a call that none can hear,

beckoned by a hand that none can see, it rushes off o'er land and sea, a wild tornado, strewing its track with wreck and ruin, and yet, all the while, and everywhere filled with that without which life in all its forms would fade and die away from earth forever. These, and ten thousand similar things that would be fearful if they were not so common, are everywhere around us, in this earthly home of ours, ever demanding our careful attention, and receiving it in exact accordance with our knowledge of our wants and wishes.

The natural philosopher pries into the secrets of their character and power; the poet sings, more or less sweetly, of their outward grace and beauty; but the mass of mankind, for obvious reasons, unable to see them in these aspects, are compelled to adopt views that are more practical and better adopted to the wants of everyday life; to ascertain and know the more prominent laws by which the phenomena of the natural world are governed, that they may live in accordance with them, and thus avoid the consequences of neglect or disobedience. For if there be one physical law which we do not know, and which we cannot therefore obey, that law is constantly liable to be broken, and the appropriate penalty incurred and inflicted. It may be safely affirmed that there is no physical evil ever felt, that cannot be traced to the non-observance of some physical law; nor any physical good enjoyed that does not result directly or indirectly from the conscious, or unconscious observance of them.

The so-called accidents that are constantly occurring, are not accidents in the usual sense of the word, nor are the misfortunes that befall us, ever the result of what is known as chance.

Our health and worldly prosperity are not blessings arbitrarily conferred, nor are sickness, or other physical calamities, curses, arbitrarily inflicted on us in the common acceptation of the term, but they are, each and all of them, the natural and inevitable consequence of the observance or violation of some physical law: a code that is so perfect, and so unlike that which regulates our moral or social conduct, that violations are

always punished, that it never excuses infancy or ignorance, nor ever inquires into the animus of the offender.

It follows from this, that the true way to live, in this one of the worlds that we live in, is to know and obey the laws which God has ordained for its government.

That true practical and useful education consists in learning the nature rather than the names of that which is around us; not in devising and pursuing favorite plans and theories, but in learning and obeying actual laws, and in remembering that he is the wisest who knows most intimately the greatest number of these natural laws, and the happiest, physically speaking, who obeys them most implicitly.

All the sciences of the learned world are but so many systematic efforts on their part to ascertain the existence and nature of these laws, and they are only valuable in so far as they tend to the attainment of this knowledge.

All the arts of life are so many ill or well directed efforts on the part of the practical men of the world to apply these natural laws to the varied wants and wishes of our race; and all arts and sciences that have any other end or purpose in view, may be ornamental but cannot be called useful.

To be physically happy and prosperous, then, in this one of the worlds that we live in, we must learn to live as though there was nothing like accident or chance on earth, but in the full faith that everything is arranged and ruled by wise, invariable law. That every murmuring rill and every flowing stream, every lofty hill and pleasant vale, every leaf and flower and fruit that grows, and everything that exists or lives or moves, on, or under, or above the earth; and every rising mist and every drop of rain and flake of snow, and every fleecy, flying cloud, and every ray of light and heat, and every fiery, flashing thunderbolt, exists, and lives, and moves, and floats, and falls and flashes in strict accordance with laws that are as wise, and certain and invariable in their action, as those which for unnumbered ages have kept the planets in their spheres, or.

send the life-blood from our beating hearts in constant currents through our frames.

Those of us who do not know these laws, or who, for any reason, or the want of it, disobey or disregard them, are sure to receive the punishment which follows fast upon transgression; while those who do know them may not only avoid these penalties, but use them as obedient servants.

See but a thousandth part of what this kind of knowledge has enabled man to do for his fellow-man! How disease has been baffled, if not destroyed, and human life not merely lengthened, but filled with physical delight; how pain has been mitigated and the horror of surgery destroyed. How the latent powers of the elements have been developed and turned to use; how steam has conquered almost every natural motive-power, until wind and tide sink almost powerless before it.

See how time and space have disappeared before the telegraph and its improvements, and darkest night turned into day by artificial light.

Armed with this knowledge, how we soar above the earth, or sink at will into ocean's deepest bed as safely as upon its surface, wandering among its coral caves; or work in deepest mine or cavern; and see and know alike the beauties of the most distant planet in the sky, as well as the innumerable worlds of insect life, that without this knowledge would have lived and died unnoticed and unknown.

Note how, by this knowledge, we catch the tempest as it rushes by, on sail or windmill, and make it carry our commerce to other lands, or turn our wealth creating looms and spindles at our will; arrest the torrent as it falls from hill to vale, and as it passes onward to the sea, use it as a giant servant in our factories.

How the bright sunbeam, as it falls from its burning source, is made to glance into the humblest camera in the artist's studio, and paint with unfailing accuracy the picture of his wish; how we turn the swift lightning from its course, as it flies from cloud to cloud, or hold it chained for future use, or make it at will, and send it laden with love's lightest whisper round the world.

This then is the mission of our lives, so far as this one of the worlds that we live in is concerned, and these and ten thousand other similar things that might be named are the results of an intimate knowledge of the laws by which God is governing it.

Our duty then and our true dignity and happiness here consists in our knowing and obeying the laws of our material life, in ascertaining with accuracy the nature of this temporary home of ours, and then, in living in strict conformity with it. To use whatever of good that we meet with, without abusing it; to feel sure that there is nothing made in vain; that there is no seeming evil that was not meant for good, and that properly used is not really good; nor any good on earth that may not be turned to evil; and to act at all times and under all circumstances, as if there were not any physical evil, except as the consequence of some conscious or unconscious violation of some physical law.

I know that it is a very common thing with some very good people to speak of events which happen here as rewards which we receive, or as punishments which are inflicted for disobedience of the moral law. But I respectfully submit, that this is as great an error as that which refers these events to chance or fortune. It results from not remembering our dual nature, and that the natural and moral laws of God move in orbits that are on entirely different planes, and for that reason are distinct and independent of each other.

It follows then from this that no amount of moral worth alone will save from death the crew that ventures on a stormy sea in a rotten, worn out, ill-managed ship, nor any amount of turpitude alone sink the vessel that in construction, condition and management is adapted to the element on which it was designed to move. They both may sink or both be saved; but the result will rest on physical and not on moral causes.

The men on whom the tower of Siloam fell in the days of our Lord; the hundreds of stalwart men who were smothered to death in the Luzerne coal mines; the crowd of dear little

children, who some time ago were crushed in the falling church; or the crew that went down to death in the ship Metropolis, were not sinners above all who were in Jerusalem, or Plymouth, or Williamsport or Philadelphia; but the men who built the tower, or the meeting-house, or managed the mine, or the ship, were sinners against some one or more of the physical laws of God, and thus produced these sad calamities. Why these particular persons were the victims, may be one of the many mysteries whose solution is reserved for the spirit land; but, why they *were* victims then and there, no one can doubt.

The thought, then, that I desire to impress is this. The violation of God's natural laws are sins committed by the mental and material portions of our natures and are punished in this world oftentimes as soon as committed, and this without regard to the innocence or ignorance of the offender; while our violations of His moral law are sins committed by our moral and spiritual natures, which, if wilful, attach themselves to our immortal portion here, and unless removed in God's own way, will follow us into a world where nothing that is of earth can come, and cling to us there with all their fearful incidents and consequences forever.

Within this material world, and subject, of course, to the laws by which it is governed, there are various minor worlds, created by our social conditions in some of which we must all live, and which are governed by laws peculiar to each, with penalties that we cannot avoid, unless we are strong minded enough and independent enough to rebel against their law-givers, ignore their codes, and live entirely outside of their several domains.

For example, here is the "*world of fashion*." A world that exists and has perhaps existed in every age, and among every people on earth whether civilized or savage. A world with laws that are enacted by, no one knows whom, that come with great regularity, or, perhaps, I should say, with great irregularity from, no one knows where, which produces results that no one can foresee, and imposes penalties that few can afford

to incur. A code that is just the reverse of that of the Medes and Persians; that enforces no natural duty, but sometimes insists on the performance of some rather unnatural ones; and which within its proper sphere is absolutely unalterable until, it is altered.

The aim of this code is not very high nor very holy, neither is it, properly speaking, low or sinful. It regulates, with the same power, the fashionable tattoo on the body of a South Sea Islander, the vermillion daub on the nose of an Indian warrior, and the carmine rouge on the cheek of a civilized belle. It prescribes to a hair the cut of a coat or a polonaise, the set of a Piccadilly collar, or a ruche, and orders the hair to be dressed "a la Pompadour" to-day and "banged" to-morrow, with the remorselessness of a Grand Sultan of Turkey. It prescribes the size and shape of hat and bonnet with sublime indifference to the size and shape of the head that is to wear it, and is so binding on all who are under its dominion as to render them as impervious to reason or ridicule as a stone wall, and who meet all suggestions as to taste in dress, or the want of it, with the unanswerable argument, "This is the way they wear them now." It enters at will even into the house of mourning, and regulates sorrow for the "dear departed" by the yard, and measures grief by the width of a hat-band or the depth of a tuck, marks the degree of relationship to the deceased by buttons and frills, and the days of mourning by the gradual fading of the sombre dress that was required at first to meet them; and while all these orders are despotically issued and implicitly obeyed, the name and home of these imperious law-makers is ever allowed to be and remain in the category of things which, in the expressive language of Lord Dundreary, "no fellow can ever find out."

In this, as in the material world, those who would be considered wise among their fellow-subjects must know the laws by which it is governed, and obey them, if they would live in peace. None but hermits can afford to disregard them, and even they in time adopt and somehow require adherence to the

rules which, in one way or another, come up to regulate the shape of the tonsure, the roughness of the hair-cloth shirt, and the hempen rope that holds their tattered robes around them.

Another of these worlds is the "world of politics." I speak not now of that species of politics that great men know as statesmanship, nor of those politicians who are known as statesmen, but of politics and politicians which are neither. Unlike the one last mentioned, this world is one, in which those who rule the other, have no place, and in which none can become subjects until they have obtained what is called the "years of discretion." Into this world you, young gentlemen, will soon enter; already your advent is expected; already the horde of anxious office-hunters in your respective wards and districts are waiting for you; already your names are enrolled on that important list of men who, at the next election, will "*vote on age.*" This world, like all others, has its laws, with their appropriate penalties; but, unlike the world of fashion, we can easily trace these laws to their source. They have their origin in the purest personal selfishness and ambition, and are designed to band masses of men together under various enticing banners, that they may, at the bidding of self-constituted leaders, surrender the right to do their own thinking in regard to public affairs, to hurrah for platforms which they sometimes never read or understand, and for candidates for whom they have no respect, and cast their votes, year after year, not in accordance with their own sense of right, but in accordance with the orders of men who have the acquired or natural art of covering their ignorance or impudence with bluster, or with blarney as the case may require it; and in this way govern township, county, state and nation for their own personal advantage. With these men the opinion of the Assembly of Divines that was held at Westminster, as to what is the "chief end of man," is of no kind of account; their idea of it is to "glorify office and enjoy it forever." With them, too, the end ever justifies the means, and the highest positions in state or nation are sometimes

attained by methods that have the lowest origin. Primary meetings, held in the meanest groggeries, composed of men who haunt such places, name and choose the delegates who fill the county conventions and nominate the county tickets, and select the delegates to represent the counties in the State conventions, who, in their turn name the State candidates, and those who are to fill the national conventions, and thus the man who represents the nation to the world reaches his proud position by means that originate among the very dregs of society, and is made thus great, by a sort of political evolution.

The theory of Darwin, which asserts that mankind grew, by evolution, from a race of apes, is not so incredible when we see such grand results connected with such low beginnings, and, reasoning by analogy, we might be almost willing to assent to it, only it would be such an unprovoked insult to the monkey!

In this world of partisan politics, the beatitudes of its peculiar gospel are showered upon the man who always "*sticks to his party*," who believes that the platforms of his party are always the embodiment of governmental wisdom and constitutional law, who never doubts the fitness of every candidate on the ticket for the office for which he has been named, or, that every petty ward and township election is "a crisis" in the State and nation so important that not a vote (if it is on the right side) dare by any possibility be omitted, and that the only real unpardonable sin that can be committed consists in voting a mixed ticket.

Here, too, the rule prevails, that wisdom consists in knowing the laws of this world, and comfort and prosperity in obeying, and in allowing other men to do their own thinking—and yours also.

There is one other social world in which we live, which I will refer to now, and that is the "world of sectarian religion." The "Church" has aptly been compared to an army with banners, and I might add, "a great many of them." The disposition to arrange themselves into groups and *coterie*s was among the earliest manifestations of the Christian converts.

To be known as followers of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, was a matter of great moment, though very sternly repudiated and rebuked by the great Apostle. But, notwithstanding this rebuke, the habit still continues, and, I think, increases. I would not pretend, without a Theological Dictionary near me, to name one-half of the Christian sects into which the Christian world is now divided, nor, without the spirit of prophecy, undertake to say how many more will be added to the catalogue. I am not here to condemn this. It is, perhaps, the necessary and inevitable result of our mental and moral constitution; and the sum total of the good they do in this way, may far exceed that which would result from a closer union of all the branches of the church. Where essentials are alike and correct, differences of opinion as to minor matters may well be excused, and, as in military life, men are proud, and justly so, of the deeds which their particular regiment, or brigade, or division of the army has accomplished for the common cause, so, in the Church, (if I may be permitted to continue the military metaphor), men may be pardoned if, in view of what their particular denomination has accomplished, they are proud to be known as members of the "Presbyterian Blues," or "Quaker Greys," or "Episcopalians Grenadiers," or "Wesleyan Flying Artillery," or "Baptist Marines." Outsiders may smile at this, and wonder, as St. Paul did, why they are not "all of Christ," but, in view of human nature as it now is, they can scarcely censure or condemn it. The danger—perhaps the only danger—that may arise from the divisions and close communions is, that such high regard for our division commanders (how tempting these military metaphors are,) may tend somewhat to lessen our devotion to the "commander-in-chief," that each one may, in time, come to believe that his is the "crack regiment," and the others only skirmishers on the outposts of the army, containing, it may be, some well-meaning men, but terribly deficient in discipline and order, and that thus, in time, instead of breaking down the thin partitions that divide them now, they may be tempted to multiply and strengthen them, and build, in their stead, adamantine walls

that will reach from earth to Heaven, without an opening through which good men of other faiths can see each other's honest faces, or take each other by the good right hand, or bid each other God speed, brother, in your journey to the better land.

In this world, too, if you would be considered wise among its peoples, you must know its peculiar constitution, and its very peculiar by-laws, its "creeds" and "catechisms," its "forms of concord" and confessions of faiths, and if you would glide along easily and pleasantly through it, you must never entertain, or at least never express a doubt as to the fact that to your division of the Church the oracles of God have been especially committed.

If I might be permitted here to add one word of general advice as to how we should live in these social worlds, I would say, In the "world of fashion" never seek to lead, and if you ever follow, do it very far off. I do not advise rebellion; that would be useless; but, live in it as a quiet foreigner, rather than as a loyal subject. You cannot destroy its rule, for it has outlived unnumbered dynasties. You cannot reform it; all reformers here become martyrs; but you can move among its subjects as a quiet restraint on its follies, and in this way, do some good to others without much injury to yourselves.

In the "world of politics" never follow anyone; but strive with all your might to lead—at least yourselves. Bring all party platforms to the test of common sense and the constitution; and all party candidates to the test of the Ten Commandments, and by these standards accept or reject them. Do not try to live out of this "world of politics." You have too much at stake in it. If you never trouble yourself about politics, politics will, some time or another, be sure to trouble you. Be sure, such sin as this will "find you out," in the shape of the tax collector, if in no other way. Do not boast that you belong to no party, for unless there are always partisans to watch and expose the conduct of our public men, we shall all of us suffer for it.

Attend your primary meetings, for just as these fountains are pure or impure, so will the stream be. Put your purest men into public places, and do all in your power to relegate the low horde that have been allowed too long to occupy them, back to their proper position. Don't aspire to the doubtful honor of "making up slates" for the party; in nine cases out of ten it is better for the public to assist in "breaking them," and act at all times so that the blessings and the burdens of government fall alike on all.

Let no man be above or below the law, and remember that here, too much government is a curse. If you are a native born citizen, never forget that the earth is the Lord's, that all men are your brethren, and that our land is an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, where all law-abiding citizens are alike. If you have come here from other lands, and look upon your naturalization as a form under which you have acquired a right to vote, and run for office, but that your hearts are still at home, then have you made the great mistake of your lives.

No one expects that you should forget the home of your childhood; that you should drop at once the "Wacht am Rhein," or the "Marseillaise Hymn," or the "Groves of Blarney," and sing in their stead nothing but "Hail Columbia," the "Star Spangled Banner," or "Yankee Doodle." You would not be true men if you did.

But if you can't forget the Battle of the Boyne, if you can't be Protestant without indulging in tantalizing Orange processions; if you cannot show your love for Saint Patrick and the mother Church without testing the comparative strength of Catholic cudgels and Protestant craniums; if you are determined to import and naturalize your old world feuds, and fashions, and follies, instead of your strong and well-tried national virtues; if you insist upon separating yourselves from the mass of your American fellow-citizens, and organizing your various nationalities here, perpetuating and fostering your agrarian notions, your aggressive rationalism and communistic ideas, regardless of the peace and comfort of those who were here

before you, and by whose liberality you enjoy the rights and privileges which now surround you; in short, if you cannot in spirit and in truth become American citizens, the sooner you return to your native lands the better. There, where you first saw the sun, you may be of use to some one, for God never made any thing in vain; but here, with such principles and practices, you are fast becoming a nuisance. As citizens of the "world of politics," ever war against political crime, or fraud in all its forms, no matter by whom committed; for a successful crime of this kind becomes a precedent dangerous to all. Destroy without remorse all useless offices, for they eat out your substance; and diminish as rapidly as possible the horde of hungry office hunters, in accordance with the rule laid down by William Penn, in the early days of Provincial government; to wit, "When the applicants for any office become numerous, the salary thereof shall be reduced."

In the world of "Sectarian Religion," strive neither to lead or follow. Lead no one unless you are sure that you are right and infallible: and follow no one but the common Master. Adhere to your respective Churches, if you think they are right, or nearly so, but accord to every other person the same liberty of opinion. Forget not the assembling of yourselves together, but be neither superstitious nor exclusive. All places are holy where the Lord is; and no place is holy where He is not, if such place can be found. In the journey through the wilderness *He* was with his chosen people, wherever the Ark rested and the Tabernacle was erected, and besides this it was authoritatively announced some eighteen hundred years ago, that men need no longer worship in the temple with the Jews, nor on the mountain with the Samaritans, because from that time forth "every man should be a temple for the living God to dwell in."

Stated social worship in peace, with none to make us afraid, is a high and glorious privilege, but it is not by any means religion. Good works are most commendable in all, but they are not always the out-birth of religion. Religious worship and

religious work are like the blossom and the fruit of a tree. Many trees that are full of blossoms in the end produce no fruit; (we have all seen this), but we have never seen and never will see, a tree producing fruit where there were no blossoms. Churches and congregations are like the ocean, a vast collection of single drops of water, grand in appearance and powerful in the results which by aggregation they are able to produce; but it should never be forgotten that the smallest drop that can be filtered from the sea contains within itself every element of which the mass is composed. As a drop it is perfect, and needs no addition, but as a drop it is almost powerless for good. Only as a mass is the ocean full of power; only by combination and association can any great work for others be accomplished in the Church.

As individuals rely not too much on the efficacy of creeds and names; no Church or association can long exist without a creed or a constitution; but never forget that creeds are the work of man, while religion is the work of God. The names of the good and mighty dead in the Church are entitled to all honor, but the world has turned round many times since those who framed our creeds have gone to heaven, and many truths that were to them utterly unknown, are now discussed and known in every school-house in the land. They worked in their time well and wisely, and wonderfully, too, for the age in which they lived, and many of them "builded better than they knew," but they were only men doing for themselves and those who were to come after them, the same work that we must accomplish for ourselves and posterity, under the same natural and spiritual laws, but with a light they never dreamed of.

Trouble not yourselves much (unless you are to become teachers) with the theological dogmas of that century, or any other, except the first. Hamper not your brains with the old-time controversies about consubstantiation and transubstantiation, and predestination and foreordination, and other similar hard things that terminate in "ation," but endeavor as you

pass through the years that God may give you, to "deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God, to visit the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and keep yourselves unspotted from the world."

But there is another more important world, in which I think we live, to the consideration of which I invite your attention: a God-made world, designed as a home for that portion of our two-fold nature which is not material, and which is to this as substance is to shadow;—a world for which this one was made, and which, like it, is governed by laws adapted by infinite love and wisdom to those for whom it was intended. I am aware that the general truths of "life everlasting," and of a "spirit land beyond the grave" are almost everywhere believed in, or at least assented to. But it will not be denied that this belief, or assent, is often so indefinite and uncertain, so overlaid with theological dogma, so weakened by rationalism, or so neglected and undervalued in this materialistic age, that its real worth as a living truth is well-nigh lost.

I desire, therefore, here and now to recall something of that which has been revealed in relation to it, and I venture to affirm as propositions that are evident or easily proved; That our nature is two-fold, a mysterious compound of soul and body; That to our souls there is given the power to gather around them from the material world the substance of which the material body is composed; That our form here is what is called "human," because that is the form of our souls; That our souls are immortal, and continue to live in the human form after what is called death, in a world that is properly adapted to their wants and wishes, and, lastly; That this spirit-land is not far off, but near us, so that while in the body, and in communication with those who are like us, we are so constituted as to be under the influence of its laws and its inhabitants.

Bear with me, please, while I endeavor briefly to recall some thoughts which tend, it seems to me, to establish these propositions, trite and common as some of them are to most of you. I assume (in an audience like this) that we are not mere

animals,—not merely a brighter link in the chain of animated nature that begins with the atom, and ends with the angel. We *know* that, while, as to our bodies, we are controlled by the laws which exist in time and space, there is another portion of our natures that is almost independent of them. A something to which heat and light, cold and darkness, time and space, are as though they were not.

Its origin is not the same as that of the natural body. The first soul that ever lived on earth was breathed into man *after* his body had been created. We know that its life is not sustained by the food which sustains the body. Its nutriment is purely intellectual and spiritual. Its duration and strength are unlike that of the natural body, for it is often strongest when the body is weakest, and sings its songs of triumph when its earthly home is about crumbling into dust.

We have in us, therefore, something that is superior to our bodies, or rather, we are something that assumes and uses our bodies for a time, but is independent of them. Our nature is therefore twofold.

That this portion called soul is immortal, is also clear from reason as well as revelation. The thought is intuitive among all peoples and at all times. In sentiment, if not in expression, the thought of one of England's noblest poets is as universal as our race :

“Thou wilt not leave us in the dust,
Thou hast made man he knows not why,
He thinks that he will never die,
And Thou hast made him. Thou art just.”

That soul must be debased, indeed, that does not “shrink back upon itself and startle at destruction,” that has “no fond desire, no longing after immortality.”

Indeed, so brief and sad and varied is our life on earth, so little can we know of that which is to be known here, that a belief in the annihilation of the soul would destroy all the faith that we have in the goodness, wisdom and constancy of God. But its immortality has been brought to light in the Gospel, and thus all doubts have been removed.

If unending existence is conceded there must be existence in form, for a formless existence is an absurdity.

If this existence, after what is called death, be in form, that form must be human, or else mutual recognition and identity will be lost, and besides this all the departed who ever appeared to the mortal eyes, that were spiritually opened for such visions, were in this form.

If existence in form be conceded, there must also be substance, for without some kind of substance, material or spiritual existence is impossible; and if we continue to live in a substantial human form, there must be some plane or sphere on which we *can* live and act and suffer or enjoy that life; and if these conclusions be logical, this plane or sphere must be controlled by laws adapted to those who inhabit it, or it must be beyond the limit of omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent power. There is, therefore, a spiritual world, designed as an everlasting home for the human race, after what is here called death.

All this I know is trite enough, for, that somewhere in the boundless universe such a spirit land exists, is an article of all religions, whether pagan or Christian. The idea entertained of this spiritual world is, of course, elevated or degraded, just as the degree of wisdom and goodness of those who entertain it is high or low. To the Indians of our Western world it is a "Happy Hunting Ground," where the game will never diminish, the arrow never fail, and the hunt never weary. To the voluptuous nations of the East it is a paradise of sensual delights.

But it was reserved for the revelation of the Christian era to declare with anything like certainty the existence and nature of this other world and life. Still, even here, so much has this grand revelation been clouded by literal interpretations, that it is accepted by many only in the form of a future state of existence: a state that will surely come for all, but which must be preceded by a general resurrection and a general judgment, which has not yet taken place, and which may not happen for ages yet to come.

How this thought can exist in minds that entertain as true the fact of endless life and immortality, and who know that the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who left this world centuries ago, is announced as, not the God of the dead but of the living, is hard to understand, but that it does exist in many a Christian mind none can deny.

Regardless, however, of this dogma, there are times and places when the pure truth of this revelation will assert itself; for while this long, long sleep is always asserted in the pulpit, it is ever abandoned at the death bed and the grave. There, if nowhere else, the faith in an immediate entrance into the spirit land at death is assumed, and no room is left in the minds of bereaved friends for the dogma of an almost everlasting sleep in death of those who leave them. There, if nowhere else, are we allowed to rest in the belief,

"That the eye that shuts in the dying hour,
May open the next in bliss.
That our welcome may sound in the Heavenly world,
Ere the farewell is hushed in this.
That we pass from the clasp of our mourning friends,
To the arms of the loved and the lost;
And that smiling faces will meet us there,
Which on earth we have valued most."

Again, that this spirit land is not far off, but very near, and that from it come influences which affect us while here, is also clear to unclouded reason and plainly asserted in revelation. It is no false thought that

"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth
Both when we wake and when we sleep,"

for we are assured by authority which none will dispute, that "Ministering **ARE** angels sent forth to minister to some," while on the earth. Indeed it would be most strange if it were not so.

It is an invariable rule in God's government, so far as we

can observe it, that for every proper end there are ever proper and sufficient means provided for attaining it, and that there is everywhere and at all times, an adequate supply for the appropriate wants of all that He has created. Now if there be on earth a being that has wants and wishes higher than those that can be fully satisfied with that which is material, is it credible that this universal rule as to want and supply will cease when and where it is most needed? We have bodies which we know are constantly and adequately supplied with everything that is necessary for their sustenance and growth, for their full and perfect development; and we have souls which acquire and form, and, for a time, use the bodies, so to speak, as a residence; but which can find in all the material universe no satisfying food; that can master the most abstruse secrets of the worlds of matter, and long for other worlds, and clearer light, and stronger mental vision than can be had while in the body, that live and grow, and must, therefore, be sustained by appropriate food and be controlled by appropriate laws; that are in the body and on the earth, but not of either, that are ever fettered by material things, and ever striving to rise above them. Now, seeing and knowing all this, can we hesitate to believe that all the wants peculiar to their nature are constantly supplied by Him who made them as they are, and that they, too, even while here have their appropriate sphere of progression, life and growth, and action.

But, again, there can be *no* result or effect without an adequate and appropriate cause, and a moment's thought will convince any but the most confirmed materialist, that this material world is not in any sense a world of causes but simply of effects. Results or effects are everywhere around us, but the causes which produce them we never see. By observation and reflection, we classify these results, and in that way ascertain the laws on which they rest, the conditions under which they occur, generalize these rules and name them; but, there we stop.

For instance, we perceive that bodies unacted upon, remain

quiescent, and we call this "inertia"; bodies unsupported, fall to the earth, and we say that it is owing to the "attraction of gravitation." Certain particles of matter attract or repel each other, and we call this the result of electric affinity or repulsion. One element consumes most things that come in contact with it, and we call this the process of combustion. A vivid flash of lightning darts from cloud to cloud, and we call it electricity; and knowing these things, we come, in course of time, to avoid, or use them; but, save that we have learned the conditions under which they occur, what do we know about the causes which produce them? The simple, unlearned, religious mind refers them all to the Great First Cause; but the Christian philosopher is never content with this solution alone. For he knows that God ever works by means that are orderly, and wise, and efficient, and never by arbitrary command, and he strives, therefore, to gather up, link by link, the chain which connects these effects with the Great First Cause, and thus unites material results with causes that are spiritual.

He perceives the orderly arrangement which characterizes all created beings, that all things here appear in forms, and that each and every one retains in all renewals its own peculiar form. That the oak which was planted within the past few years, is like the oak that grew an hundred years ago; that the cedars of to-day are like those that threw their sombre shadows on Mount Lebanon, in the time of our Lord; and so of all things else, and he is led, in this way, to inquire, how are these forms so regularly produced? Where is the model after which they are so unerringly and so regularly renewed? Is all this the work of chance or accident, or are they self-created products of the elements of the natural world? And as no sane mind can rest long on a theory like that, it is compelled to look to some higher plane for the causes which produce these results, which, not being material, must be spiritual. Now if this conclusion be logical and true as to the influence of spiritual causes on material things, is it unfair to conclude that the same relation exists between spiritual causes and spiritual ef-

fects, and that the river of life, clear as a crystal, which flows from the Throne of God, is life for the soul as well as for the body? Can we, for a moment, entertain the thought that our material life lives and grows by virtue of influences which come to it from on high, while that portion of our being that is immortal and spiritual has no appropriate sustenance here, nothing to aid it in growing in goodness or grace and fitness for its everlasting home? That, one of the means adopted for this purpose is the *revelation* given to our race from age to age, as they were able to receive and understand it, is undoubted, but, is that the only way in which we can receive truth? Are not *revelation* and *inspiration* correlative terms? Whence then come our thoughts? A new intelligent idea enters the mind; a valuable thought, which, if properly cultivated, will result in the production of some great good for the benefit of mankind. Whence came it? It may have been suggested by association, for thoughts often come in that way; but, they also often come to us by some clearly internal way. The scientific materialist and the Christian philosopher have theories in regard to this, that are as diverse as can be conceived; theories that can never be reconciled. I had occasion recently to inquire into some of these scientific theories that I might compare them with that which I humbly believe to be the true one.

One class of these scientific materialists affirm, with great show of close investigation, that thoughts of all kinds are the result of some sort of chemical action in the brain. An oxygenation, as they term it, of its atoms; and many learned pages are filled with the reasons why this theory should be adopted as the true one.

Another class, who do not seem quite sure of the truth of that theory, take the ground that thought is produced by the action of what they call the "molecular machinery" of the brain, (whatever that may be), and endeavor to sustain this view by scientific analysis of the mechanical powers.

Still another school of philosophers insists that our thoughts

are caused by the action of the brain, which they aver is constructed after the manner of a voltaic battery.

I do not like, even, to seem to undervalue scientific research or learning, or jest with scientific theories, but, shades of David, Isaiah, and the other prophets, of Milton, Bacon, Shakespeare, *et al.*, to think, for one moment, that your grand thoughts that have lighted up the literary and religious worlds for centuries, should have no other origin than the chemical oxydation of your brains, or the working of your "molecular machinery," or the spasmodic discharges of your cerebral voltaic batteries! The Christian philosopher falls into no such learned follies. As he is sure of the existence of an inhabited material world, because of the phenomena which it exhibits to his bodily senses, so is he sure of an inhabited spiritual world, and of his intimate connexion with it, because of the thoughts which are ever with him, and which, from their nature, cannot have a material origin. He knows that man is a creature, and not a creator; that he is a mere recipient of life and goodness and wisdom, and not the author of either, and, knowing this, it is no surprise for him to hear, nor blind, unthinking faith, to believe in continuous inspiration. If thoughts come to him that are intelligent, whether good or bad, he knows that they must come from an intelligent source. If suggested by an intelligent source, the intelligence must exist somewhere, for, intelligence without existence is absurd; and, if this being or existence be not within the range of our bodily senses, it must be above or beyond them; not material, therefore spiritual. We receive these thoughts as they come to us, and either repel and discard or receive and act on them, and, in this way, while here, are in constant communication with spiritual existences, and living in the spiritual world much as we live in the atmosphere of earth, which we feel and know, only when it is in motion.

But, this position is also sustained by authority. It is taught most clearly in the Jewish and Christian systems of religion, as any Bible student will admit. "It is not possible (says an eminent writer), to rise from a perusal of the Scriptures, Old or

New, without feeling that the existence of a world of spirits, and the verity of communion with its inhabitants, is the ground-work of all that is contained therein. It is not left to inference or construction. Nothing like chronological or narrational variances which commentators may reconcile or philologists explain away. It is a matter that is inherent, essential and fundamental. Concede, if we will, that much of what we read there may be allegory; make all due allowance for the phraseology of the Oriental tongues, for the language of parable and the license of poetry, there still remains, vast, calm, and not to be mistaken, the firm faith of that old world in the influence exerted here by the world of spirits. Undermine that faith and the entire Biblical structure is destroyed. "All along its history, all through its pages, from the time of the burning bush, or when Jacob wrestled with the angel, and saw, with his spiritual eyes, the crowd of Heavenly visitants pass from Heaven to earth, down to the last bright vision on the Isle of Patmos, everywhere we meet this truth, and he that would deny it must seek another revelation."

In all these recorded instances there is no intimation that these visitants came or were sent from a distance; but, as though ever near, but unseen, their appearance is ever preceded by an opening of the spiritual sight. "And his eyes were opened," or "his eyes were enlightened," or "I was in the spirit," or "the hand of the Lord was on me," these and similar expressions are those in which all the spiritual visions of the Bible are ever recorded, and then, as on the instant, there were seen, by those to whom such privilege was permitted, beings who, so far as natural sight was concerned, had no previous existence.

To the Bible student these facts have no answer that is consistent with the truth of revelation. The Christian philosopher also knows that inspiration has a broader sense than that which is conveyed by the announcement that "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," but, that men were and still are also inspired to work. The painter, and poet, and

sculptor, and others of like nature, have their peculiar gifts from God, and did not, and could not make themselves what they are. That Moses at the burning bush, and Samuel in the temple, and Paul on his way to Damascus, and Ezekiel and John in their sacred visions, were not more truly inspired than was Bezaleel, the son of Ur, of the tribe of Judah, who we are told, was "called by the Lord and filled with the spirit of God, in wisdom and understanding and knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, and to devise curious work, and to work in gold and silver and brass, and in cutting of stones and to set them, and in carving wood, and to make all manner of cunning work," and he feels sure that this kind of inspiration will never cease while God is God and man is man. He knows that the arm of the Lord is not shortened, and that the human race are as near and dear to Him as when they lived in Eden, and, that it is contrary to His law of order to neglect, in any sense, the more important portion of our dual nature,

He believes that what was once possible, and not uncommon, is not impossible now, and that although for centuries, there has been "no open vision," there may be and will be, whenever the temporal or eternal welfare of mankind requires it. That

"Spirits still may come from realms of glory
To visit earth as in the days of old ;
That now as in the days of ancient story,
Heaven is not distant nor the earth grown cold ;
That their last hymn was not to Bethlehem given,
When other stars before that one grew dim,
Nor their last presence known in Peter's prison,
Or where exulting martyrs raised their dying hymn."

Nor does he feel that he must wait for this until he enters into what is called eternity, for he knows that

"We are in eternity from birth not death,
Eternity is not beyond the stars in some far off hereafter,
But here and now ; so near we see it not,
Save by our spirit sight.
We close our eyes in prayer and we are there in thought.
And thoughts are spirit things, thoughts are realities
Upon the other side."

I trust I need not say that I have not now, nor ever had, nor ever expect to have the slightest sympathy with what is called spiritualism ; or any faith in the spiritual theory which some strive to establish with raps and mediums and table tipping, and especially with the materialization of spirits. I can think of nothing more sinful than some of their exhibitions are.

The idea of assuming to converse with or materialize the "spirits of just men made perfect," or any others, before a promiscuous crowd of spectators at fifty cents a head, seems so shocking to every moral and religious feeling, that those who assume to do it should be compelled to spend a portion of their lives in a penitentiary, and those who believe that it can be done, should retire for a while to the quiet seclusion of some well-conducted lunatic asylum.

The influences of which I have spoken, and for a belief in which I contend, are the natural and orderly ones, whose existence is conceded by all systems of religion, and whose powers are illustrated in Holy Writ, both Jewish and Christian ; influences which are almost forgotten in this money-loving, materialistic age of ours, but which must resume their place in our churches, or Christianity itself will lose its influence as a life-giving revelation.

If then the spirit land is near ; if our mortal lives are watched by those we cannot see, and our hearts are impressed by those we cannot hear, who, just as we encourage or repel them, will leave us, or remain and mould our lives in harmony with their own, then are we bound to study and know and obey the laws by which this one of the worlds we live in is governed.

If from the spirit land, since the fall of man, false tempters whisper the suggested sin, or purer spirits come to our hearts with better thoughts, let us not listen to their words with careless, heedless ears, or follow either with unthinking steps ; but try the spirits whether they are of God, and encourage or repel them, as we find them true or false. This is our great moral duty as resulting from the laws of our immortal nature.

All sins that stain us are our own. They consist not in the

suggested thoughts, but in the disposition we manifest to encourage and adopt them. We must act, or omit to act, in order to violate any of the laws of our physical nature; but the wish, the desire to act out our evil thoughts are sins against the laws of our spiritual nature.

Whitefield hit the point precisely when he said, that "if he could not prevent the foul birds of earth from flying over his head, he could—and with the help of God he would—prevent them from building their nests in his hair." This is all the power we possess over good or evil inspirations; but it is all that is necessary, and we can test our moral and religious status with certainty, by the manner and spirit in which and the extent to which we exercise this power.

To live as we should live in reference to the spirit land, we must learn its laws and obey them, must watch our thoughts with faithful care, and, repelling all that are evil, encourage the good and govern our lives accordingly. When from the spirit land around us there comes to us, as come there will until probation's hours are ended, suggestions from the false and fallen, who are ever near to lure us from the upward course that leads to brighter worlds; when ambition, or avarice, or selfishness, or envy, or hatred, or other hellish thoughts present themselves, our course is plain. Resist them and they will flee; and as they shrink back to their infernal homes, purer and brighter and holier thoughts from purer, higher and holier minds that are ever near us, will take their places and mould us into an image of themselves.

This is the real battle of life. This is the plane on which the contest for man's soul is ever going on; and as we fight or yield, so will we who "hold the fort" fail or triumph. If we are faint, or feeble or faithless in the conflict; if, one by one, these evil thoughts find place in our affections; if one by one these evil counsellors find in our hearts a friendly and congenial home, then will their numbers increase, until they lead us captive at their will. But, if we are true to our high duty and destiny; if we wield, as we should, the weapons that are given

to us for defense, and force back the powers of darkness, until it can be said of us, in the innocence of God-given wisdom, as was said of those who were in the innocence of unconscious ignorance, "their angels do always behold the face of my Father in Heaven;" then will the victory be almost certain; then will we have commenced a life on earth, which, if persevered in, will end in peace and happiness; then will we be, while here, in close communion with those who have run their course on earth, whose intellects are shining in the bright, clear beams of Infinite Wisdom, and whose hearts are basking in the pure, warm rays of Infinite goodness and love.

Thus, passing on through life, attended as we go by companions such as these, that which we know as death will be but a change of homes; "a bowing of the wearied head on earth; an entrance into another mansion of our King, larger than this and lovelier;" while they who then will stand unseen around our beds to watch us as we close our eyes in that long sleep that knows no earthly waking, will not in sadness as we pass away, say to us here, "Good-night," but in their own bright, happy heavenly home bid us "Good-morning."

ART. VII.—THE NATURE OF THE SOUL.

REV. ALLEN TRAVER, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

I.—IN all civilized countries where knowledge is diffused, and science spreads its beams, as well as in lands where men are nature's untutored children and see God in storms and hear Him in the wind, the belief prevails that the thinking principle is spiritual, entirely distinct in nature from the body, which is only its tabernacle. While it is readily admitted that our knowledge of the nature of any substance is only through its qualities and attributes, and while it is absolutely impossible to know more of the nature of the soul as spirit than the naked fact that it has such properties, the judgment of men is, that the soul, in which inhere all the attributes of a moral, intellectual, and voluntary nature, is distinct in nature from the body in which it dwells.

There must be something underlying thought and volition. There must be something back of this which is called spirit in distinction from matter, or matter must be endowed with the power of thought. Concerning this substance, four theories may be advanced. 1st, Thought must belong to one single, indivisible particle of matter. 2d, Or it must belong to a number of such atoms or particles united, constituting in some sense a unit. 3d, Or it must be the play of the brain and of its organs, or the secretions of matter. 4th, Or it must be admitted that all the creations of a rational nature are the fruit of an immaterial substance, which we call the soul.

It does not seem probable that the power of thought and volition resides in a single, indivisible particle of matter, because these parts are so minute, that man has not yet detected them in their ultimate form by the use of even the most power-

ful microscope. We cannot bring ourselves to the conviction that that which is the designer of the works of art, which conceives, plans, and executes is matter, or some form and refinement of it, endowed with conscious and personal life.

Our intuitive convictions and common-sense principles reject it. It seems the climax of absurdity to suppose that any such ultimate particle has, in connection with the properties of matter, those also of thought, feeling, memory, and imagination, or can study the sciences, pierce the heavens, and observe the remotest objects that glitter on the confines of space, by means of instruments; that it can create epic poems which are like a history of the creation, form governments for nations, search out the secrets of nature, map the created universe, and then receive a revelation from the Infinite Being.

The second inquiry is, does the power of thought exist in a number of particles of matter, united by some common bond? If thought does not proceed from one particle, if it is not an attribute of a single atom, is it the property of a limited number? The unity of man's nature as recognized by consciousness denies this. The nature of mental phenomena, as thought, feeling, and reason contradicts this. Thought is by one, simple, indivisible agent. One thought of any person cannot, as we conceive, come from one particle of matter, and another from another, nor is there the one-fourth or one-eighth of a thought. Particles of matter vary from year to year. They may accumulate and be so arranged as to produce an effect on the mind, or affect the organism with which they are connected, but they have no new property like that of thought, no power like that of fancy, the imagination, or the will. There are various particles of matter in the mineral, vegetable, and animal world. They are hard or soft, fine or coarse, warm or cold; but here is no thought. It is a well established fact, that living animal bodies and our own material forms are in a state of constant and unending change. They are wasting hourly, and undergoing repairs continually. They are consumed and rebuilt many times during the period of life, from infancy to old age.

The particles of our bodies at this time are not those which formed them a few years previous to this. But their identity is preserved, independent of this change. And this is continued during the period allotted to man on earth. Notwithstanding this complete renovation, we are conscious of the unity of the mind and its permanent and constant growth. There is the continuation of its distinct peculiarities, of its hopes and fears, its feelings, consciousness, and knowledge. While the body has changed, the soul holds on the even tenor of its ways toward an unseen future. In many instances the body can scarcely be said to live, so near is it to corruption and death, while the mind glows with intellectual vigor. It remains clear and vigorous to the hour of death. The soul holds its identity, while the body, by slow or rapid changes and daily transformations, or the results of disease, disappears in death, and the identity of the body during life is the evident result of the soul's connection with it.

The third theory is that the brain secretes thought as the liver does bile, and that thought is the result of the play of organs. This is a favorite theory of some physiologists, but they have evidently lost sight of some palpable distinctions. There are a number of valid objections to this theory. The liver does not secrete as mere matter. If dead, it does not; and if there were not some form of life-principle different from matter, working in and through it, it would never produce secretion. Moreover, the bile is composed of separate particles of matter in the process of secretion, and it has no unity as thought has. It is also urged that the action of the soul in life depends on bodily health. From this position the conclusion can be easily reached that the thinking part of man is a refined and more perfect organism than the body. The brain is the organ through which the operations of the mind are performed. If this organ is impaired, it follows, as a natural result, that the action of the mind will be impaired, and its operations disturbed. If a skilful musician undertakes to play on an instrument unstrung or broken, he cannot produce that harmony

which he could were the instrument perfect; but if the instrument is very much impaired, nothing but harsh and discordant sounds can be produced, and there will be only the wild discord of the maniac's mind. It would be most illogical, however, to affirm that the powers of the musician were impaired, since it is owing to the impaired and deranged state of the instrument. Now it seems self-evident that what the instrument is to the musician the brain is to the soul. And as the musician has an existence distinct from the instrument, so the soul is inherently distinct in its nature from the brain.

The fourth theory, which we regard as the correct one, is that the soul is an immaterial substance, entirely distinct in its nature from the body, and from all forms of matter. That the body thinks and remembers, is repugnant to the common sense of mankind, and to the feelings and intuitions of all who have not lost their sense of superiority to the brute. This is one of the deepest convictions of our nature. He who meditates on the movements of the present or reflects on the past, seeking to read its lessons or aims, to discern the future and pry into its secrets; he who seeks relief in sleep, and instead of refreshing repose is scared with dreams and terrified by night visions, believes that there is a spirit in man, and that this spiritual essence constitutes man a rational, responsible, and an immortal being. He who judges that God is the life and the sovereign of the universe, believes that there is a soul which animates the body, dwelling in it, though distinct in nature from it, but yet that the soul and body are united in close embrace by a bond which is the life, and that when this bond is broken, they separate—one returning to the earth from whence it was taken, the other departing to the spirit-world. That the thinking principle is a spirit distinct in nature from matter is a tradition, a sentiment of the heart, a deduction of the reason, and a self-evident intellectual truth. It is as universal as humanity, and as old as history. While we cannot prove it as a mathematical truth, we believe and act on the conviction without argument, though this is not wanting when sought.

It is too far back in the elemental state, too deep in our nature to require logical proof. We are more certain of it from our instincts, and from the fact that it is a native conviction, a self-evident truth, than we could be from any process of demonstration that can be devised. When the intellect constructs arguments for it, we consider them specimens of the creative power of the logical faculty, and allow that they have a certain degree of force, yet these do not serve as well as instinctive feelings and intuitive convictions. Men can have no more reasonable doubt of the spiritual nature of the soul than they can have of the material nature of the body. Belief of the fact does not depend on culture. It exists under the wildest forms of barbarism as well as under a civilization which exhibits the highest degree of Christian culture. As an element of strong belief, it is found in the American Indian, in the Hottentot, and Malay. We are assured that it was more general in the time of Homer than it was in the time of Socrates. There is not a doubt insinuated in any of the Homeric poems or characters, as to man's being a spirit distinct from matter, nor is there a doubt there hinted of a future life.

The idea of the separate nature of the soul, as contrasted with the body, and of its future being, is coeval with our race, and is not due to tradition, but is the result of native intuition, or of a special suggestion from the source of all truth, to those who have formed the successive generations of the race. This is not the result merely of reflection. The finger of God, as with the pen of a diamond, wrote it on our nature. There are a few who profess to believe that the soul is material, and that thought is the result of the play of organs, that it is purely a brain product, not produced by a spiritual agent. At long intervals one rises up who professes to hold this view. These materialists consider man as a being superior in degree, but not in nature to the animals by which he is surrounded. They assert that we like them are only intended for a transitory existence, which terminates with the dissolution of the body, and that the only rational enjoyment is to devote themselves

to sensual pleasures and worldly good while life continues ; and that when the body dies all thinking ceases, and the soul is lost in annihilation. When this is stated as a philosophical theory it is found repugnant to the natural feelings of mankind. Indeed it very rarely rears itself as a belief, claiming attention on a large scale, except in a period of very great and general corruption, when society can neither bear its vices nor endure their remedies, and when nations are on the verge of a fearful revolution, like that which resulted in the destruction of the Roman empire, the French revolution, the convulsions connected with the reign of terror, and the various anarchies which have prevailed on the earth. Then men avow materialism in all its nakedness and deformity. It spreads where the vices and corruptions of men have prepared the way for it. It is the precursor of ruin, and the cause of political convulsions and upheavals in society. After the work of desolation has been achieved, and men return to sober views, from the reaction produced by physical suffering, anxiety, and fearful forebodings of future evils, it is rejected with abhorrence, or yields to the power of truth. Men soon realize in times of calamity the penalty of seeking to degrade and debase their nature. Some materialists do not deny the immortality of the soul ; but he who denies that its spiritual nature is distinct from the body is on his way to the denial of a future life. When we die, we have every evidence that not a particle of matter leaves the body. Hence there is no immortal part to man, or the soul is an entity which departs unseen by the eye and unknown to all the senses. While it is alleged that we cannot comprehend the nature of the spirit, neither can we form a distinct conception of thought and reason as products of matter, for nothing in the universe of material things is strictly of the nature of thought, volition, and emotion. There is no analogy in nature warranting the assumption that spirit is the result of specific modifications or combinations of the atoms and forms of matter. Various chemical changes may be produced by human skill. We may combine an acid and alkali, and thus form a neutral salt differ-

ing from both elements, but it is not vivified with life. The statuary places before us the nicely chiseled form of the "Greek Slave," or of the "Apollo Belvidere," but the marble is cold and still. It has form and bulk, but there is no new existence, no life that throbs there, nothing in man can vivify it. The whole universe of matter has nothing equivalent to thought, volition, and emotion.

II.—The distinct nature of the attributes which center in mind and matter indicate the soul's spiritual nature. By matter we understand something that impresses the senses, and which we estimate on physical principles. But we learn the nature of the soul by what we discover in the consciousness. Its faculties are unlike the properties which belong to material substances. The qualities of one are quite diverse from those of the other. The knowledge which we gain of the material world is the result of perception through the senses. That which we gain of the soul is through the light and the action of the consciousness. We call a piece of iron or the fragment of a broken rock matter. These have the following properties, viz.: impenetrability, weight, color, and inertia, which inhere in some substance unknown except through these qualities. But the soul also has faculties and attributes, which we can distinguish and name as we do those of matter, as the consciousness, perception, memory, reason, imagination, fancy, will, and conscience. These are absolutely distinct from the properties of matter. And if the substance in which one class inheres is matter, must not the substance of the other be mind, spirit, both created by the Infinite? One is visible and tangible, and the senses testify to its materialism. The phenomena of the other are revealed to the consciousness, and we behold that testimony by looking within the soul and reading the truths and the inscriptions of it in its own spiritual light. The organs of the senses are unused for the time. The world of nature is excluded. The soul becomes the object of inspection. It searches its own folds, considers its own actions, purposes and works, scrutinizes its own phenomena and regards with pleasure

the results of its spiritual activity and being. The memory and reason are not seen with the eye of sense and are unlike the attractive and repulsive forces of nature. We cannot compare them because they have no point in common. Hence it is unreasonable and unphilosophical to refer these powers to the same cause, and to suppose that the thinking soul is some form of matter. Impressions can be made on material bodies as wood, and stone, and steel. These can be copied and transferred from one to the other. Objects can be placed before a mirror and the various images formed thereon will be reflected from it, and we behold them with wonder. All these can be destroyed. But the soul is a nature which is not only susceptible of knowledge, but indestructible. When not impaired in any of its functions and all its powers are free, it reflects more images in the consciousness and in its own light, and far more rapidly than can be formed and transferred from any mirror. The mirror only reflects the objects, but the soul reflects them so that they are seen in the consciousness, stand in its clear light, and are retained for future use under all the vicissitudes of life, in misfortune and sorrow, in prosperity and joy. "How strange, (says Socrates,) that the ear should take in all possible sounds and never be filled, and that the eye should receive a vast multitude and variety of images, and be receiving new ones at every succeeding moment, and yet always be as free and as ready as ever to receive others still." Matter has mechanical and chemical properties, but no arrangement of them whatever can invest them with the power of moral and intellectual activity and development. By the analysis of material substances, and then by a new synthesis, we can vary and modify the properties and develop qualities apparently new or latent. This is the result of new modes of combinations. If the subjects of a new arrangement in varied proportions are minerals used in medicine, they may develop the property of poison or medicine. But the new combination neither in fact nor in principle is able to impart new life. A change in composition and proportion confers no new property, though it

may develop latent ones into action. Our bodies are composed of particles of matter which retain their peculiar character under the most wonderful changes. These bodies are the servants of a master within. By their use as subjected to the behest of the spirit, they achieve more than all other organisms with which man is acquainted. But in themselves they fail of the phenomena of thought, feeling, and volition. The chemical agencies in nature, when in action, are most fearful in their results, as in the burning of gunpowder. The mechanical powers are vast and powerful, and without them the pyramids could not have been raised. The telegraph and other inventions used by means of nature's laws and forces, sprang into practical being at the touch of man's soul. But thought, feeling, memory and volition are phenomena which no reasonable man ever thinks of assigning to attraction, repulsion, or chemical affinity or any action of material or mechanical or molecular causes, elementary or combined. Professor Tyndale in his inaugural before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, shows the impassable barriers between matter and spirit, and how insoluble the simplest problems of being and consciousness are when subjected to the most refined analysis of the materialist in the following extract, and yet in this he admits too much, we conceive, by far. "I hardly imagine that any profound scientific thinker, who has reflected upon the subject exists, who would not admit the extreme probability of the hypothesis, that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought or of emotion, a certain definite molecular condition is set up in the brain ; that this relation of physics to consciousness is invariable, so that, given the state of the brain, corresponding thought or feeling might be inferred ; or giving thought or feeling, the corresponding state of the brain might be inferred. But how inferred ? It is at the bottom not a case of logical inference at all, but of empirical association. You may reply that many of the inferences of science are of this character ; the inference, for example, that an electric current of a given direction will deflect a magnetic

needle in a definite way; but the cases differ in this, that the passage from the current to the needle, is not demonstrable, is thinkable, and we entertain no doubt as to the final mechanical solution of the problem; but the passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought, and a definite molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously, we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor apparently any rudiment of the organ, which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from the one phenomenon to the other. They appear together, but we do not know why. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened and illuminated as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be, and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem. How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness? A chasm between the two classes or phenomena, would still remain intellectually impassable. To whom has the secret been revealed? Let us lower our heads and acknowledge our ignorance, one and all. Perhaps the mystery may resolve itself into knowledge at some future day."

III. (a.) The laws of mind and matter indicate that the soul is totally different in nature from matter and all its refinements. The laws imposed on the soul are very different from those imposed on matter. A law of nature or science differs widely from a law of mind. Natural laws show us the fixed modes of nature's movements. Spiritual law exercises authority over the moral and spiritual nature, character and conduct of free agents. Law in nature denotes an invariable order of sequence, and can be disturbed only by the author of nature, which disturbance constitutes a miracle. Moral and spiritual law make demands which remain the same spiritual imperatives whether conformed to or disobeyed. A rule of duty differs not

only from a law of science, but applies to a region where diverse phenomenon prevail. One is a command to a free, rational intelligence. The other is a mode by which certain ends are reached in the plan of creation by an invariable and certain mode. The force or property we call gravitation governs bodies, and to it there is not an exception. If one single fact under it should fail, there would be no certainty that it was a law, and there would be no assurance of uniformity in the fall of bodies to the earth, or should it suffer modification, the law would undergo a corresponding change. Natural laws are principles in nature which serve us in classification. Knowledge of them enables us to subdue the earth and use it. We ascertain their existence by a process which Lord Bacon calls the "dissection and anatomy of nature." Physical law is an ordinance entirely distinct from moral requirements. It is enduring, yet can be altered by the Divine determination, so that the visible universe would cease to be what it is. But moral law addressed to the soul, the will and the conscience is unalterable, because it expresses the character of God, and has authority where it is violated daily without fear or remorse. It is addressed to spiritual agents endowed with free will. Natural laws are principles which describe the mode in which things move without involving reason or conscience, or consciousness, or will, and are invariably obeyed. But innumerable instances of human action do not agree with the spiritual law of our Maker. Still the law remains and never remits its authority, even if the entire universe of rational beings, from the highest angel to the child just budding into conscious responsibility, were perverse, and not an action were in harmony with its requisitions, the law would remain and claim submission to its behests. (b.) In this connection we further observe that we admit that when the intellectual nature of man acts, it acts according to laws of mind which are its principles of order. The student pursues learning according to the laws of his mind, not on account of them. On the supposition that he is conscientious, he studies because it is his duty to use the time and

the means given to him for the purpose of improving his mind. And when he does this, the laws of the soul regulate its action, as unconsciously as do the laws of matter the events of the physical universe. These are the normal principles of the soul, and are modes of its action. We cannot with truth confound the law of motives with the law of motion, and then reason from one to the other, as if they were of the same nature. Neither can we confound the two departments over which they preside. It will not do to argue that mind is moved and so is matter, and hence they must be of the same nature, and that the causes moving them are parallel. It is reasoning of this sort, whether reflected on and detected in its false assumptions or not, which really influences every fatalist in the construction of his theories. And it is these gratuitous and most unwarrantable assumptions, that in every age and under every garb have been the occasion and the reliance of error and false reasoning, and the prolific parent of those manifold delusions which work such ruin in the spiritual realm of man. Hence we repeat that mind is not matter, or a refinement thereof. Soul is not body or anything like it. It is a creation and a nature as entirely separate and distinct from matter as is God Himself. It is a spirit made in the Divine image and governed by its own laws. And its nature is not to be comprehended and its worth realized by reasonings that confound matter and mind and the laws of the two. Matter moves only as moved by force. Mind moves of itself from motives. Matter rests, while spirit is active by nature. Mind thinks, reasons and wills, and moves the body to action, while matter has the quality of inertia or repose, and moves only as it is moved by some other force. The material world changes because natural and spiritual forces move on and in it, and produce new combinations. . . . (c.) The doctrine of the material nature of the soul is absurd when applied to the will, as one of the central forces of the soul in the actions of life. Will power supposes freedom, liberty, choice. There is the ability to receive and act on a conception or an idea which will be realized, or proved void of reality. There are motives influencing

the mind. There are acts of judgment and decision. There are acts of will, and consequent conduct springing from it. Materialistic theories of the soul destroy this idea of the will, and argue that it is the motion of matter, and that as matter is governed by fixed laws, all that follows and flows from the exertions of the will is as necessary as the union of chemical agents, and that there is no moral or free will, no liberty, and that as it is the result of the laws of motion, it is a necessity, fixed as fate. What now must we infer from these views of materialism? Simply this. There is really no deliberation, for that contemplates two possible courses, whereas the laws of matter can have but one. The idea of deliberation is groundless, and yet necessary, for it results from physical laws which are immutable. Crime is, therefore, imaginary. It is inevitable under the circumstances, being the product of necessary laws.

If the soul and the body are of the same nature, and the laws of mind are the same as the laws of matter, and the law of motives as the law of motion, then all human events move in revolving circles and not in spirals which illustrate the law of progress in the soul and in the race. Who can believe that the controversies and efforts and toils and sufferings of successive generations only bring the race to the condition in which past generations lived. Do our children start at the same point and in the same circle in which our grandparents did? Is the moral world and the empire of free agency like the earth on its axis, only moving round in an orbital cycle without improvement? This no one credits. The movements of human society and of the soul in intellectual, social, civil and religious aspects, are both spiral and progressive as well as circular. Each revolution reaches a higher position than the former attained. The laws of identity, assimilation, growth and change in the soul are different from those of the human body and of the material world. There are laws of identity in both the natural and spiritual realm. The seed and the child plant are as truly the father of the mature plant and fruit as the child is

the father of the man. There are births and deaths in the particles of the blood, but ultimate particles are combined or repelled according to certain laws of attraction, cohesion, affinity or repulsion.

“The law that moulds and forms a tear,
And bids it trickle from its source,
That law preserves the world a sphere
And guides the planets in their course.”

But the explanation of the wonders of nature on mechanical and chemical principles must stop somewhere, for all kinds of matter are not so homogeneous or indeterminate as to unite with equal facility with every other kind, witness oil and water. Chemical processes arise because of distinct properties; and while some repel each other, others attract, and some are indifferent. There are other forms approaching an organism, as the crystal and the diamond, intended for the higher purposes of beauty and taste, but they are not for the indwelling of life. Through the blind and unconscious agency of electricity and kindred forces, crystals and diamonds are produced by a law which is one of the most beautiful in the entire range of nature. The separation of matter, one part being left as rubbish, and another taken and wrought into fine forms, indicating a higher purpose and end, is worthy of our careful consideration. We pass now to organic substances and their life principle. Materialism faintly affirms that there is no distinction in nature between a vegetable and a crystal only in their form. This is evidently erroneous, for there are organisms dependent on the life of the vegetable, which are higher than refined matter. All particles, human, animal and vegetable, have affinity for their organisms and each other, and are mutually adapted to promote growth, while others are repelled as unproductive capital. Organisms are renewed only by their natural food. These particles are united and organized by a constructive life-principle into a beautiful form, but in the laws and affinities of particles there is no architectonic plan or con-

structive power, which selects, arranges and constructs in harmony with its own inherent principles. There is something higher and of more force in a vegetable than subtle chemical forces. And it is perfectly absurd to suppose that a wise plan and principle of order could originate in matter. Plants, rude in form, or of rare beauty, are more than organic forms. They have the principle of vegetable life, and a law of growth and development is in their nature. In accordance with these, moisture ascends and food is drawn from the earth through the roots, and born on the current of the sap along the arteries, and incorporated into the organism of the plant. The force of the ascending sap will support a column of quicksilver thirty-two and a half inches in height, and is there nothing here of a higher nature than mere affinity, and that in opposition to the law of gravity? Each individual plant-life has the power of extracting from nature the requisite materials for growth. They have the additional power of disposing of them in the exact order necessary for the formation of their own kind and not another, each having its seed in itself. Each genus and species and individual is marked by this peculiarity. We admit that physical laws as attraction, cohesion and chemical affinity act in plants similarly to their action in rude matter. Chemical laws and forces are involved, but were there no vegetable-life principle there never would be a plant. All natural forms originate through ideas, and exist by virtue of a higher power than themselves. The idea is the archetype, but the life and unity proceeding from the archetypal conception is not the unity of will as seen in man's spiritual powers. As the essential and inherent nature of a rose is not the materials which appear to the eye, and are recognized by the senses, which the chemist can detect and handle and separate from each other and from the rose, as the same materials, too, may be in any other body, while the essential nature of the rose does not exist there in reality, but in the invisible power and principle of life of the rose as it pleased God to make this life-power which manifests itself in the color, form, beauty and

fragrance in all its changes, developments and history, so the human soul is distinct in nature and faculties from all matter and its refinements. Succeeding this order there is the animal kingdom with life, instinct and brute intelligence in organized bodies. There is creature mind in all the teeming forms of beauty and strength found in air, ocean and earth; but this is far inferior to man. The animal is not rational, though we admit that it has a certain kind of mind. It has instinct, sensation, perception and memory. Animals have five senses, and sensations of pleasure and pain. They evidently remember and compare. A parrot cracks a nut that is sound, but rejects a hollow one. Brutes have a will of their own, and we use the spur or bridle as needful. They also show signs of shame and of pride. They seem to know, but are destitute of *self-consciousness*. They do not know right from wrong or good from evil. They have no conscience or moral convictions, and are not accountable, not being endowed with reason. But man is the crown of creation, a physical, intellectual and a spiritual being. His bodily organism is superior to all creature forms, and is fitted for a nobler guest. Add life and emotion and instinct to our bodies, but that does not account for conscience and reason. Materialism may say put life and organization together, and with the blood flowing through a healthy brain, mind and reason will be developed as an electric wire around a magnet gives it the power of attracting iron. But this is not probable.

Mysterious though the human organism is, there is nothing in it which accounts for life and mind, consciousness, reason and will, thought or conscience. The brain is a fine spun structure, and the mind depends for its action on this as an instrument, but it has never been shown that mental action is the action of the brain. Mental energy may be accelerated or retarded by a healthful or a diseased state of the body, for the power and skill of an agent are manifest, as is the perfection of the instrument. These are unquestionable facts; but it has never been shown whether the brain acts as a whole or in separate organs,

or at some central but undefined point, when the mind works. Where there has been one known act of the soul, and a corresponding action of the brain supposed to be clearly demonstrated, there have been hundreds of instances of mental action in which nothing can be observed of the state of the brain. All that has been done is to trace the action to a central organ, the movements of the power to the driving wheel. And spirit is the only adequate power and force to move this. Particles or ultimate atoms are infinitely little. Does one constitute the soul, and does this rise from nature to God? The Pineal gland hangs by supports from the bed of the optic nerve, an infinitesimal particle. The soul may reside here, but is it the soul? We can receive the mysterious fact that spirit is located in the body, and impinges at this or some other point, but it is inconceivable that that point is the thinking principle. Haller affirms that various parts of the encephalon have been destroyed but that no important change was produced with the intellectual and moral powers. M. Flourens proves beyond reasonable doubt that the brain may be destroyed to a great extent without destroying any of the mental functions.

“The purple stream which through my vessels glides
Dull and unconscious flows like common tides.
The pipes through which the circling juices play,
Are not that thinking I no more than they.
This frame, compacted with transcendent skill,
Of moving joints obedient to my will,
Nursed from the fruitful glebe-like yonder tree
Waxes and wastes. I call it mine, not me.”

There is no identity in nature like the will-force. There is no centralization like that in the consciousness. There is in spirit an enduring oneness, and in the will a leading force and power, and in the consciousness a unity and an unchanging oneness which materialism does not explain. Sensation alone does not comprehend within itself any such ingredient. There can be neither personality nor identity on such a theory.

(e.) The retentive or conservative power of mind indicates the source. "In order to render memory possible on the materialist's hypothesis, every throb of a nerve and every vibration of the brain must leave its life-long traces in the material structure. But to conceive of this, carries us immeasurably beyond the marvellous disclosures of microscopic discovery. Myriads of legible and enduring entries must be made within every needle's point of the brain."

(f.) Materialistic philosophy affirms that body and mind grow and decay together, and that if death intervenes not when the body fails, second childhood follows, an emptier blank than the first, because it is imbecility without promise or hope. But this is erroneous, for the soul often matures while the body grows feeble. In every department of mental activity, men have displayed great talents and concentration of powers, and won their brightest laurels, amid bodily decline. The ablest judicial decisions have been given in England and America, by judges who had reached the age of seventy. Lords Brougham and Lyndhurst, when they had passed the period of three score and ten, and when their eyes had grown dim, and bodily force abated, exhibited thought as clear as the sun of their noon, and grasped the profoundest subjects in the circle of human interests, and in the systems of scientific truth. It is said that one, when eighty-six, required assistance to rise from his chair, yet his addresses were replete with wisdom, and marked with as much or more eloquence than in former years. And the same can be said of the younger Adams, "the old man eloquent," and others known and unknown to fame. In great age, when the body failed, they still exhibited the fruits of genius, talent, patriotism, and humanity, that charmed their generation.

IV. The spiritual nature of the soul is argued from a consideration of the use of language and the achievements of the mind through it. Language is an expression of our thoughts by means of words. It is an enfleshment of thought, and all languages have words that are expressive of a distinction between soul and body. We find this in the Hebrew tongue,

which was used by the oldest nation of antiquity and by inspired men. We find in it distinct words for these distinct entities, one meaning the spiritual, the other the material. One of the first manifestations of thoughtful consciousness springing from primary conceptions, and recorded in the unimpeachable testimony of language, and found living in all literature, and in the experience of life, is this unslumbering conviction of the distinct nature of soul and body. The Hebrews called the mind ruah, Gen. ii. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 39. In the 2d place, this word means the vital breath of man and beast, Eccl. iii. 19-21. In xii. 7 of the same book, we read that this ruah-nature returns to God, and the body to the earth. In the third place, this word means soul, mind, the spiritual that penetrates the unexplored regions of the universe, Isaiah ii. 2, Ezekiel i. 12. When the word basar is used, it means the body and all material things and objects.

And now we raise the final question, Is that which produces thought in words that thrill our nature, merely matter in play, the vibrations of certain organs and nerves, or is it of a higher and nobler nature? Do the harpstrings evolve music, or does the soul evolve it by means of the harp as the instrument? The theory of materialism may appear plausible to some when announced in a general way, but we find on subjecting it to a critical examination that it has no solid support. The world of matter cannot precede the world of mind, and produce and arrange trains of thought, as we find them in the field of truth. A material spring and origin is not adequate to the production of such a spiritual stream, for the fountain must be higher than the stream. It is a natural conception, if not an intuitional truth, that nothing but a soul, of spiritual origin, nature, action and destiny, can create thought, and embody it in fine forms, material or otherwise. It must be a living, spiritual agent and power, vital in all its parts, that can penetrate nature, gather her truths and principles into the personality, and give them a living expression during the period of natural life.

Finally, consider the creations of the soul, and inquire have these achievements of man proceeded from ought but a spiritual nature? When he recognized his existence and grew into consciousness, he found himself surrounded by mysteries, and felt the pressure of want. The first and most essential of his creative processes, was that of mechanical inventions, which began with the rude handiwork in the garden of Eden. This grew into arts and trades among the unspiritual posterity of Cain. One wrought in brass and iron, another was the father of such as handle the harp and the organ. Inventions have given to man power, wealth and luxury, and all forms of material good. The bowels of the earth have been explored. Earth's strata have been mapped and their rich contents revealed. The steam-ship breasts the fiercest storms, and myriads have a home on rolling billows. The lightning rides post from city to city, and has a safe submarine race-course, and friendly messages are born from continent to continent. We count the orders and calculate the numbers of animate nature in a drop of water. With the telescope we survey the heavens and understand the laws and balancing principles of her grand and beautiful astronomy.

The imagination, following the ideas of the reason, and using the materials gathered by the fancy, has wrought in the realms of the unknown and reared marvels of poetry, romance and of the fine arts. Philosophy has sought causes and found systems where there was seeming confusion, and discovered harmonies. In the department of philosophy, man has considered facts, causes, systems and ends, but has failed to resolve the consciousness into a form or particle of matter. While there is much that is mysterious in thinking and in the genesis of thought, we trace it to its unknown source as we do the streams to the fountain amid the eternal glaciers of the Alps, where the rivers of Germany originate. And as the traveler stands appalled in the presence of the gushing stream, so we stand with awe and wonder in the presence of the inscrutable nature and mysterious agency that thinks incessantly. When we contemplate the workings, ongoing and growth of thought and literature,

and consider the myriad achievements and monuments of the human soul, we are disposed to bow in the presence of our own fearful nature, and to stand in penitence before God whom it has offended. This thinking soul is a living spiritual reality, not divine, but the creation of God made in His image, related to Him, and should be recreated and moulded for an inheritance of all that is good. On earth there is nothing great but man. In man there is nothing great but mind. And the mind or soul becomes truly great as it acquires likeness to God through Christ.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A MIRACLE IN STONE. OR, THE GREAT PYRAMID OF EGYPT. By Joseph A. Seiss, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion; author of "Last Times," "Lectures on the Gospels," "Lectures on the Apocalypse," "The Gospel in Leviticus," etc. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 822 Chestnut street.

In order to be able to criticise this volume from its own standpoint it would be necessary to give more study to the subject than our time and taste have allowed. The claim made by the author and those whom he quotes is, that this greatest of the pyramids of Egypt is a revelation equally with the inspired Word of God. It contains, according to the author's theory, the secret of the physical universe, as the Bible is the revelation of the spiritual world. It manifests, when properly understood, such proportions and signs as indicate that the builders were under divine direction in some way, as really as the writers of the Bible were inspired. A cursory examination of the work has not made an impression on our mind favorable to the author's theory. It seems to us that many of the likenesses, comparisons, proportions, &c., are strained and far-fetched. The physical universe as a whole has its mathematical laws, and no building or structure can be erected that does not fall within the compass of these laws; so that certain wonderful likenesses and proportions could be found in the measurement of any house, somewhat like those the author finds in this great pyramid. There are many features of architecture that regard the number *three*, without however being designed to consciously symbolize the Trinity. Everywhere in nature and art a wonderful symbolism might be traced by an active fancy. We may even allow it to be there, without concluding from this fact that it is the result of a supernatural revelation. Such thoughts, at least, came into our mind as we read the work here noticed. And yet it would be presumptuous in us to undertake to refute the author's theory on such a basis.

While therefore we do not attempt to refute the claim on mere scientific ground, and grant that it is at least worthy of careful study, we present some *a priori* arguments which lead us to look upon the theory advanced with suspicion.

1. Our first question is, *cui bono?* We cannot well conceive what purpose is to be conserved by this miracle in stone worthy of a supernatural revelation. We can see no moral end in view. Suppose that it does reveal all the dimensions, weight, order, &c., of the physical universe, what then? Man is rapidly coming to that sort of knowledge through science, but he is not necessarily growing better by such knowledge. Nay, as this sphinx stands in Egypt, the symbol in the Bible of merely natural, worldly knowledge, and that in an evil sense, we should fear that this miracle, if miracle it be, might turn out to be of evil inspiration. "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." Not in Egypt, but *out of* it, we are to look for the revelation in Christ. A revelation, we should suppose, would make known to us the realities of the *spiritual* world, but so far as we have understood the theory of this pyramid, it has nothing to reveal of such a world.

2. We do not see how this theory is consistent with the view that the Bible comprehends the whole of divine revelation. It is the complete norm and standard for faith. No one is to add to, nor take from that book. But now here is a revelation outside of the Bible, a revelation to which no reference is made in the Bible. Would it not require the Word of God in the Bible to authenticate such a revelation? If the Word of God in the Bible is complete, then man needs nothing more to guide him in regard to his destiny.

3. We cannot feel reconciled to the manner and method of this supposed revelation. The Word of God is the method of His revelation. This is living. But a great pyramid is not living,—it is dead. It may indeed be said that we have the altar and the ark and the tabernacle in the Old Testament, and in the New our Lord performed miracles and instituted sacraments. But these stand in living union with the Word. Our Lord's miracles did not stand alone as mere wonder-works, but they always were related to some particular teaching.

There may indeed be something extraordinary about this great pyramid. It may be wonderful as revealing great advances science had made in those early centuries in Egypt. We may perhaps

even allow that there may be some things connected with it that belonged to a revealed religion. No one can well doubt but that there were in Egypt remains of an earlier, primitive religion. The fact that the children of Israel borrowed certain things from Egypt in their worship, would seem to show that they were originally from God. Not only was circumcision observed, or practised, in Egypt, but the order of the priesthood, which God ordained, and certain features pertaining to the ark and tabernacle had a resemblance to Egyptian worship. But all this would fall far short of the claim that is made in this book. We may have occasion to refer to this subject again after we have studied it more thoroughly. We do not present these remarks as in any way an answer to the theory of the book, but merely as giving our first impressions in regard to it.

NOTES ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM. For Parents, Teachers, and Catechumens. By Rev. A. C. Whitmer. Philadelphia: Grant, Faires & Rodgers, 52 and 54 North Sixth Street. 1878.

We have been much pleased with this work. It is not an easy matter to write an instructive commentary on any work. The difficulty is increased when the object is to simplify a work like the Heidelberg Catechism for children. The present one is, indeed, designed for parents, teachers, and catechumens, but through the instructions of parents and teachers it is to reach children. At the same time it is adapted for catechumens of maturer years. The task was not an easy one, but the writer has accomplished it successfully, at least with a reasonable degree of success.

We are pleased with the spirit of the work. The author makes no great pretensions. He acknowledges the difficulty of the task. Yet such a work was called for, and as others had declined to perform it he resolved to do what he could to supply the want, and we feel sure that those who examine his book will be pleased with what he has accomplished. He has special qualifications for instructing the young, and he has exercised his gifts in this direction in editing for years the *Child's Treasury*. There is no eagerness manifested in this work to launch into difficult and disputed questions, and yet the author fearlessly and candidly meets them when they come in his way. Every page manifests a close and careful study of the Catechism. The treatment exhibits sound judgment and a spirit of moderation. There is no effort to bend the Catechism in the in-

terest of any scheme of theology. Greatest stress is everywhere laid on the fundamental truths of our holy religion. The interest is practical, not speculative. Prudence is exercised in the treatment of difficult points. Even where different views will be taken, the spirit of the author commends itself for its earnestness and candor.

There is danger in such an analytical commentary that the force and meaning of the text may be weakened and obscured by the explanations. The explanation may be less simple and primitive than the text. In this respect while the author may not have attained perfection, he has at least attained a reasonable degree of success.

There are some weak places in the Catechism itself. Its warmest adherents may readily grant this. No merely human work can claim perfection, and it is time this truth should be more freely acknowledged in regard to the Reformation Confessions, and, we may add, our current theologies. The weak points in the Heidelberg Catechism result in some cases from the fact that certain points were emphasized in reference to antithetical errors at the time, and in the progress of theology these antitheses have for the most part been now superseded. We may refer here to the manner in which the presence of our Lord's humanity on earth is explained in the Catechism. That explanation had reference, as the author of the Commentary properly observes, to the Lutheran doctrine of the ubiquity of our Lord's glorified body. That whole subject is now treated from a more advanced stand-point. The best Lutheran theologians of Germany no longer maintain the old Lutheran view, and Reformed theology has advanced beyond Calvin's explanation on this subject. We might cite other points. The author has shown great prudence in the manner in which he has treated these points. He is always conservative, yet not narrow.

The external appearance of the volume accords well with its contents. It is neat and substantial, not pretentious or gaudy. The material is good, the type clear and plain for reading, just what we might expect from the house of Grant, Faires & Rodgers. We hope the book may find a wide circulation.

MANUAL OF ENGLISH RHETORIC. By A. D. Hepburn, Professor in Davidson College, N. C. Wilson, Hinkle & Co., 137 Walnut Street, Cincinnati; 28 Bond Street, New York.

This work comes to us with recommendations from Professors in a number of Colleges in this country, and it has been introduced into a large number of institutions throughout the country. The best recommendation we can give it is that it has been introduced as a text-book into Franklin and Marshall College.